3 1611 00202 1837

/PA817.R6>C1/

/PA817.R6>C1/

/PA817.R6>C1/

3 other holdings

signature & nameplate. (van Antwerp. dated 1909)

A817
R6

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 1611 00202 1837

DNW

A SHORT GRAMMAR

OF THE

GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOKS BY PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Critical Notes to Broadus' Harmony of the Gospels. Price of the Harmony $1 50

Life and Letters of John A. Broadus $1 50

Teaching of Jesus Concerning God the Father $0 75

The Student's Chronological New Testament $1 00

Keywords in the Teaching of Jesus $0 50

Syllabus for New Testament Study $0 90

Epochs in the Life of Jesus $1 00

A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament $1 50

Epochs in the Life of Paul $1 25

These books can be had through A. C. Armstrong & Son.

A SHORT GRAMMAR

—OF THE—

GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

FOR STUDENTS FAMILIAR WITH THE ELEMENTS OF GREEK

—BY—

A. T. ROBERTSON, A. M., D. D.,

Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Καὶ τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας.—2 Tim. 4:13.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON,
3 & 5 West 18th Street, Near 5th Avenue,
NEW YORK.
1909.

Saint Dominic College Library
St. Charles, Illinois

Copyright, 1908,

By A. T. ROBERTSON.

Second Printing, May, 1909.

[8-28427]

PA
817
.R6

TO W. B. ROYALL, D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK

IN

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE

TRUE GREEK AND TEACHER

483

PREFACE.

I have been a teacher of the Greek New Testament for twenty years and a student of Greek for thirty. But time is a poor measure of one's real interest in the Greek tongue if he is a Greek lover, a true Philhellene. This noble tongue contains no treasure comparable to the New Testament. We could much more easily give up Plato and Demosthenes than John and Paul. I count it a privilege and a joy to help young ministers to a right apprehension of the Greek New Testament. At bottom exegesis is grammatical. That is not all of exegesis, but it is the true beginning.

A few years ago I published a little Syllabus of New Testament Greek Syntax for the use of one of the Greek classes here. The book was used in a number of other institutions also. I desire now to replace it by a more extensive and comprehensive discussion of the field of New Testament grammar and yet not one too long. During the years, in fact quite recently, I have received numerous requests for a New Testament grammar not so elementary as Huddilston, Green, or Harper and Weidner, and yet not so minute and exhaustive as Winer, Blass, or Moulton. The man who has studied the old Greek does not wish to take up a primer, though he may not be ready for the more critical minutiæ of a book like Winer. New Testament grammar is taught the last year in most of the colleges and is begun also the first year in the theological seminaries. It is just this definite and unoccupied field (the last year in college and the first in the seminary) that this Short Grammar seeks to enter. There is here an unfilled place in American educational method. I have written a number of chapters of a larger grammar of the Greek New Testament on the scale of Winer which I shall finish as rapidly as I can.

But that need will also be met by Moulton's New Grammar, of which the brilliant Prolegomena has already appeared, not to mention Blass's able work also. Schmiedel and Schwyzer are likewise at work on a complete revision of Winer, a portion of which has appeared. Winer-Moulton and Winer-Thayer still have a sale and deserve it. Rademacher also has in hand a N. T. Grammatik. The prospect therefore is good for plenty of the larger grammars in the future. But this intermediate type of grammar is a practical necessity and an urgent one. Three types of New Testament grammars are needed: a beginner's grammar for men who have had no Greek training, an advanced and complete grammar for scholars and more critical seminary work, an intermediate handy working grammar for men familiar with the elements of Greek both in school and in the pastorate. The busy pastor needs the Short Grammar. The text of this Grammar is that of Westcott and Hort with constant use of Nestle and Tischendorf. It is a satisfaction to note how commonly the excellent critical text of Nestle agrees with that of Westcott and Hort.

The plan of the present grammar is determined by the object in view. Condensation is practised as much as possible with clearness. The paradigms are not given, having been already acquired by the student, but brief discussions of the New Testament variation in forms occur. Hadley and Allen's Grammar or Goodwin's Grammar can be used for review of the forms. There is little criticism of the views of different grammarians. The space is reserved chiefly for the positive presentation of the main points of New Testament grammar. The effort is made to put the chief facts in such a way as to enlist the interest of well prepared men who know Attic Greek.

This grammar is written after much study of modern methods in philology and research. The author acknowledges his debt to Dr. Adolph Deissmann and Dr. J. Hope Moulton in particular who have inaugurated a new era in New Testament grammatical study. The results of modern study of comparative grammar, modern Greek, the inscriptions, the papyri, etc., are kept constantly in mind. I have not been able, for lack of space, to draw largely on

these treasures by way of illustration. But my interest in the new method of grammatical study goes back to the days when I first heard John A. Broadus, "vir doctissimus" (Gregory, Prolegomena, Vol. III., Nov. Test. Graece, p. 1266), teach New Testament Greek from the point of view of comparative philology. He so taught it because of his work with Gessner Harrison, of the University of Virginia, who was lecturing on Bopp's ideas when they were novelties in America. I owe more to that impulse than to all else. For ten years I have been planning a Greek New Testament Grammar, and now I send this one forth as a commission in a sense from my great predecessor here.

I cannot hope to have made no errors. I have said what I saw and have not hesitated to put things differently from the current grammars if truth led me on. I shall appreciate notice of *errata* for future editions or suggestions that will make the book more useful for the purposes had in view.

I call this A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament rather than of New Testament Greek. We can no longer treat the Greek of the New Testament as a dialect or a *patois* or least of all as a sacred language unlike anything else on earth. It is merely the vernacular κοινή of the first century A. D. written by men of varied culture, but all touched by the Spirit of Christ and familiar with the LXX. Greek and most of them show knowledge of the Aramaic of the time. Most of the writers were Jews. But it is not Hebrew Greek. It is the Greek of a group of books, not a separate dialect.

I cannot recount here my obligations to the many writers whose works I have consulted. In the larger grammar detailed acknowledgment will be made on every page, but here I must content myself with a general statement. Where it seemed necessary I have taken pains to mention a few authors by name. I shall never forget some months in 1905 spent among the grammatical treasures of the Bodleian Library of Oxford and later in the British Museum nor the many courtesies I received. But this grammar does not claim to be wholly original. If it were, it would not be true. And yet I hold no one else responsible for the views expressed in it. It will not be in vain if students can by this means be led into

a fuller and deeper knowledge of the riches of Christ. Ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι.—I. Tim. 4:15.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Louisville, Ky., 1908.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

It is only seven months since the first edition of this Grammar came from the press. It is now the text-book in many American institutions of learning and many more will introduce it in the Autumn. It is published in Great Britain by Hodder & Stoughton. An Italian translation is in process of publication from the press of Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, Florence. Scholars of the first rank in many parts of the world have welcomed the book as filling a long felt want.

The *errata* especially in the Bibliography were more numerous than ought to have been the case. I gratefully acknowledge suggestions of this nature from Rev. Prof. H. A. Kennedy, D. D., of Toronto, Rev. Prof. J. H. Farmer, D. D., of Toronto, Rev. Prof. Alexander Souter, D. D., of Oxford, Rev. George Milligan, D. D., of Murthly, Scotland, Rev. Prof. Ebrard Nestle, D. D., of Maulbronn, Germany, Rev. Prof. A. Debrunner, Germany, Rev. Prof. B. C. Deweese, of Lexington, Ky., Rev. J. C. C. Dunford and Rev. Prof. W. O. Carver, D. D., of Louisville. I have tried to free this edition from errors, but I do not claim perfection. I shall still welcome notice of further *errata* for future editions.

The general plan of the Short Grammar imposes upon it necessary limitations which are clearly recognized by critics. The structure of the work is justified by the purpose in view. Some minor changes occur in this edition. I take this occasion to salute with best wishes all toilers in the sphere of New Testament Grammar.

May, 1909. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Since completion of the plates for this edition, arrangements have been made for a German edition of the Grammar.

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

Abbott, Johannine Grammar (1906).

Bevier, Brief Greek Syntax.

Blass, Philology of the Gospels (1898).

Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek (1905).
See also Kuehner-Blass.

Boatti, Grammatica del greco del Nuevo Testamento (1908).

Boisacq, Les dialectes doriens (1891).

Brugmann, Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik (1892, 1901).

Brugmann, Griechische Grammatik (1900).

Brugmann, Comparative Grammar (Wright's tr., 5 vols., 1895).

Brugmann, Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik der Indo-germanischen Sprachen (1904).

Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek (1893).

Buttmann, Grammar of New Testament Greek (1880).

Cary, Introduction to New Testament Greek.

Claflin, Syntax of Boeotian Dialect Inscriptions (1905).

Clapperton, First Steps in New Testament Greek.

Clyde, Greek Syntax (1876).

Conybeare and Stock, Selections from the LXX. with Grammar (1905).

Croenert, Memoria Graeca Herculanensis (1903).

Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek (1892).

Curtius, Greek Etymology (1886).

Dalman, The Words of Jesus (1902).

Dalman, Grammatik des juedisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (1895).

Deissmann, Bible Studies (1901).
Deissmann, Licht vom Osten (1908).
Deissmann, New Light on the New Testament (1907).
Deissmann, Philology of the Greek Bible (1908).
Delbrueck, Die Grundlagen der Griechischen Syntax (1879).
Delbrueck, The Study of Language (1882).
Delbrueck, Vergl. Syntax d. indog. Sprachen (1893-1900).
Dieterich, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache (1898).
Donaldson, New Cratylus (1859).
Farrar, Greek Syntax (1876).
Gildersleeve, Syntax of Classical Greek, Part I. (1900). Part II. in press.
Giles, A Short Manual of Comparative Philology (1901).
Goodwin, Greek Grammar (1894).
Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses (1889).
Green, Handbook of the Grammar of the Greek New Testament (1904).
Gregory, Prolegomena. Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece (1894).
Hadley and Allen, Greek Grammar (1895).
Harper and Weidner, Introductory New Testament Greek Method (1888).
Harrison, Greek Prepositions (1858).
Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (1892).
Hatzidakis, Einleitung in die Neugriechische Grammatik (1902).
Heine, Synonomik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch (1898).
Heinrici, Der litterarische Charakter der neutest. Schriften (1908).
Helbing, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre, (1907).
Hirt, Handbuch der Greichischen Laut-und Formenlehre (1902).
Hoffmann, Die Griechischen Dialekte (1891-1898).
Hoole, Classical Element in the N. T. (1888).
Hort, Appendix (Vol. II.) to Greek N. T.

Huddilston, Essentials of New Testament Greek.
Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar (1897).
Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek (1895).
King and Cookson, Principles of Sound and Inflexion, etc. (1888).
Kroll, Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie (1908).
Kuehner-Blass, Ausfuehrliche Grammatik Erste Teil 2 Bde (1890, 1892).
Kuehner-Gerth, Ausfuehrliche Grammatik Zweite Teil 2 Bde, (1898, 1904).
Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri. Laut- and Wortlehre (1906).
Meillet, Introduction à l' 'Etude Comparative des Langues Indo-européennes (1908).
Meister, Die Griechischen Dialekte (1882, 1889).
Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften (1900).
Meltzer, Griechische Grammatik: Bd. I., Formenlehre; Bd. II., Bedeutungslehre und Syntax.
Meyer, Jesu Muttersprache (1896).
Monro, Homeric Grammar (1891).
Moulton (J. H.), Grammatical Notes in Expositor (1901), and Classical Review (1901, 1904); Characteristics of N. T. Greek, Expositor (1904).
Moulton and Milligan, Lexical Notes on the Papyri, Expositor (1908, ——).
Moulton (J. H.), Introduction to N. T. Greek.
Moulton, Prolegomena to Grammar of N. T. Greek, third edition (1908).
Moulton (J. H.), The Science of Language (1903).
Moulton (W. F.) and Geden, Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).
Mueller, Historische Grammatik der Hellenischen Sprache (1891).
Mutzbauer, Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen (1908).

Nachmanson, Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften (1903).
Nägeli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus (1907).
Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece (1906).
Oertel, Five Linguistic Lectures (1901).
Pallis, Η ΝΕΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (1902).
Preuschen, Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (1908, ——).
Reinhold, De Graecitate Patrum Apostolicorum, etc. (1898).
Riemann et Goelzer, Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin (1897, 1901).
Rutherford, The New Phrynichus (1881).
Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, Vols. I, II, III (1906, 1908).
Sayce, Principles of Comparative Philology.
Schleicher, Vergleichende Grammatik (1876).
Schmid, Der Atticismus, etc., 4 Bde (1889-1897).
Schwyzer, Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften (1898).
Simcox, Language of the New Testament (1890).
Simcox, The Writers of the New Testament.
Smyth (H. W.), The Greek Dialects (1894). The Ionic.
Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1870).
Stahl, Kritisch- historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums (1907).
Sterrett, Homer's Iliad (1907). Excellent sketch of the Dialect of Homer.
Sweet, History of Language (1900).
Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (1900).
Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (1887).
Thieme, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander und das Neue Testament (1906).
Thompson, A Greek Grammar for Schools. New edition (1907).
Thompson, The Greek Tenses in the New Testament (1895).

Thumb, Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).
Thumb, Handbuch der Neugriechischen Volkssprache (1895).
Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece. 2 Vols. Editio octava (1869, 1872).
Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (1890).
Vincent and Dickson, Handbook of Modern Greek (1887).
Viteau, Étude sur la Grec du Nouveau Testament (Le Verbe, 1893; Sujet, 1896).
Voelker, Syntax d. Gr. Papyri, I. (1903).
Votaw, The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek (1896).
Wackernagel, Die Griechische Sprache (Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Teil 1, Abt. 8, 1897).
Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien (1905).
Westcott and Hort, Greek New Testament.
Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar (1891).
Winer-Moulton, many editions.
Winer-Schmiedel (and Schwyzer), only partly done.
Winer-Thayer, many editions.

The various editions of the Greek papyri and many of the inscriptions can be consulted in the various libraries in America and abroad. The library of this institution has a pretty full set of this ever growing line of books.

The titles of the most important editions of inscriptions and papyri are given here:

Archiv für Papyrus forschung, Wilcken.
Audollent, Defixionum Tabellae (1904).
British Museum Papyri, F. G. Kenyon, (1893, 1898).
Cauer, Delectus inscriptionum Graecarum (1883).
Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions (1903).
Corpus Papyrorum Raineri (1895).
Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (2 vols., 1893).
Florence Papyri (1905).
Gaertingen und Paton, Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei (1903, 1908).

Geneva Papyri (1896, 1900).
Goodspeed, Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum (1902).
Grenfell and Hunt, Amherst Papyri (1901, 1905).
Grenfell and Hunt, Fayum Towns and their Papyri (1900).
Grenfell and Hunt, Hibeh Papyri (1906).
Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri (1898, ——).
Grenfell and Hunt, Tebtunis Papyri (1901, ——).
Griechische Urkunden (Berlin Papyri, 1895, ——).
Hicks and Hill, Greek Historical Inscriptions (1901).
Inscriptiones Graecae (Berlin) run from 1873 to 1908, XIV Vols.
Kern, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander (1900).
Letronne, Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l' 'Egypte (1882).
Mahaffy, Petrie Papyri (1891).
Michel, Recueil d' inscriptions grecques (1900).
Paris Papyri (1865).
Paton and Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos (1891).
Solmsen, Inscriptiones Graecae (1905).
Turin Papyri (1826).

For further list see Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 251 ff.; Mayser, Grammatik d. griech-Pap., S. vii. ff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Part I.—Introductory 2
Chapter I.—The Modern Method of Linguistic Study 3
1. The old contrasted with the new 3
2. Evolutionary principle of language 3
3. Greek a unit 3
4. Over emphasis on the literary Attic 4
5. Office of the grammarian 4
6. The Greek standpoint 4

Chapter II.—What is the Greek of the New Testament 5
1. The papyri discoveries 5
2. New Testament in the vernacular 5
3. Backward light from Modern Greek vernacular 5
4. The literary and the vernacular κοινή 6
5. The κοινή and the older Greek 6
6. Greek of the New Testament not translation Greek, not as a rule 6
7. The Semitic influence 6
8. The Latin influence 7
9. The Christian contribution 7
10. Individual characteristics 7

Part II.—Forms 9

Chapter III.—Orthography, Accent, Pronunciation, Punctuation 11
1. Orthography 11
(a) Difficulties of external evidence 11
(b) Final ν 11
(c) Elision 12
(d) Crasis 12
(e) Contraction 12
(f) Rough breathing 12
(g) Prothetic vowel 12
(h) Proper names 12
(i) Help from papyri 12

2. Accent 13
(a) Old scorn of accent 13
(b) Evidence of accent 13
(c) Origin of accent 13
(d) Significance of accent 14
(e) New Testament situation 14
3. Pronunciation 14
(a) Origin of modern theory 14
(b) Erasmus partly right and partly wrong 15
4. Punctuation 15

Chapter IV.—The Declension of Substantives 17
1. The history of the Greek declensions 17
(a) Three declensions 17
(b) Metaplasm 17
(c) Blending of case-forms 18
2. Special forms in the first declension 18
(a) Ionic and Doric genitives 18
(b) Nominative singular 18
(c) Vocative 18
(d) History of genitive-ablative endings 19
(e) Locative, dative, instrumental endings 19
(f) Accusative endings 19
3. Special forms of the second declension 20
(a) So-called Attic declension 20
(b) Θεός as vocative 20
(c) Ἰησοῦς 20
(d) Contraction and heteroclisis 20
(e) Distinctive forms in this declension 20
4. Special forms of the third declension 21
(a) Vocative 21
(b) Accusative 21
(c) Genitive-ablative forms 22
(d) Nominative forms 23
(e) Locative, instrumental, dative 23
5. Number in substantives 23
(a) The dual 23
(b) Words with one number only 23
(c) Neuter plurals and the verb 24
6. Gender of substantives 24
(a) Proper names 24
(b) Natural and grammatical gender 24
(c) New Testament usage 24

Chapter V.—The Declension of Adjectives 25
1. The origin of adjectives 25
(a) Line between substantive and adjective 25
(b) Sanskrit adjectives with one ending 25
(c) Adjective variations from substantive 25
(d) Specialize one use of substantives 25
2. The declension of adjectives 26
(a) With one ending 26
(b) With two sets of endings 26
(c) Used only with two 26
(d) Dropped one 26
(e) With three endings 26
(f) Compound adjectives 26
(g) Participle endings 26
(h) New Testament usage 26
3. The comparison of adjectives 27
(a) Comparison without suffixes 27
(b) The suffixes 27
(c) Use of suffixes in the New Testament 27
(d) Double comparative 27
(e) From adverbs 27
(f) Elative superlative in the New Testament 27
(g) Devices used 27
4. Adjectival numerals 28
(a) Τέσσαρες, etc 28
(b) First cardinal numbers 28
(c) The ordinals 28

Chapter VI.—The Declension of Pronouns 29
1. Pronominal roots 29
(a) Separate roots 29
(b) Relation to verbs (endings) 29
(c) Originally demonstrative 29
2. Brief sketch of pronominal forms 29
(a) First and second persons 29
(b) Third person 30
(c) Possessive 30
(d) Reflexive 30
(e) Demonstrative 30
(f) Relative 31
(g) Interrogative 31
(h) Reciprocal 31

Chapter VII.—The Conjugation of the Verb 32
1. Relation of verb forms and noun forms 32
(a) Roots and stems 32
(b) Verbal suffixes 32
(c) Verbal substantives 32
(d) Verbal adjectives 32
(e) New Testament forms 33
2. The building of the verb 33
(a) The main word of the sentence 33
(b) Original roots neither verb nor substantive 33
(c) Analysis of the verb 33
(d) Relation of suffixes to theme 34
(e) Disappearance of μι verbs 34
3. The tenses 34
(a) The aorist 34
(b) The present-tense system 35
(c) The future system 37
(d) The perfect system 38
(e) Reduplication 40
(f) Augment 40
4. The modes 41
(a) The indicative 41
(b) The subjunctive 41
(c) The optative 42
(d) The imperative 44
5. The voices 45
(a) The active 45
(b) The middle 45
(c) The passive 46

Chapter VIII.—Principal Parts of Some Important Verbs 48-56

Chapter IX.—The Formation of Words in the New Testament 57
1. The history of Greek words 57
2. The kinship of Greek words with each other 57
3. The contrasts in Greek words 58
4. Compound words 59
5. Light from other tongues 59
6. New Testament developments 60

Part III.—Syntax 61

Chapter X.—The Sentence 63
1. Definitions 63
2. Subject as center of group of words 63

3. Predicate as center of group of words 63
4. Predicate and copula 63
5. Apposition with subject and predicate 63
6. Number in subject and predicate 63
7. Gender with substantives and adjectives 64
8. Case in apposition 64
9. Simple and compound 64
10. Words, clauses, sentences, paragraphs 64

Chapter XI.—Substantive, Adjective, Adverb 65
1. Parts of speech related 65
2. Elements of speech 65
3. Origin of adjectives 65
4. Adjective in Greek 66
5. Predicate or attributive adjective 66
6. Infrequency of the superlative 66
7. Adjective as adverb 66
8. Adjective without substantives 66
9. Adjectives with the infinitive and with various cases 66
10. Cases of adverbs 67
11. Adverbs as prepositions 67
12. The article with adverbs 67
13. Adverbial phrases 67
14. Adverbial participles 67
15. Comparison and composition of adverbs 67

Chapter XII.—The Article 68
1. The indefinite article in Greek 68
2. The origin of the definite article 68
3. The meaning of the article 69
(a) Individual objects from other individuals 70
(b) Classes from other classes 70
(c) Qualities from other qualities 70
4. What the article is used with 71
5. When the article is not used 72
6. Some special uses of the article 73
(a) The correlation of the article 73
(b) The article with attributives 73
(1) Adjectives 73
(2) With genitives 73
(3) With adjuncts 74
(c) The repetition of the article 74
(d) The article with predicates 75

(e) The article with proper names 75
(f) The article with pronouns 76
(g) The article with πᾶς 76
(h) The article with μέσος 77
(i) The article with the nominative as vocative 77

Chapter XIII.—Pronouns 78
1. What is the pronoun? 78
2. Persistence of pronouns 78
3. Emphasis 78
4. Αὐτός in predicate 79
5. Position 79
6. Omission 79
7. Third personal pronoun 79
8. The reflexive 79
9. Possessive 80
10. Demonstrative 80
11. Relative 81
12. Correlative pronouns 82
13. The indefinite pronoun 82
14. The interrogative pronouns 83
15. Reciprocal pronouns 85
16. Alternative expressions 85

Chapter XIV.—The Cases 86
1. Cases in the Indo-germanic tongues 86
(a) Eight cases in the Sanskrit 86
(b) Varied history of the eight cases 86
(c) Sanskrit case endings 87
2. The origin and use of the cases 88
(a) The word case 88
(b) Object of cases 88
(c) Origin of the use of prepositions with the cases 88
(d) Blending case forms 88
(e) Distinctive idea of the cases retained 89
(f) Origin of the case endings 89
(g) Interchange of cases 89
3. The nominative 90
(a) Ending ς 90
(b) Original use not subject 90
(c) Properly appositional 90
(d) In apposition with other cases 90
(e) Nominative independent 91

4. The vocative 91
(a) Case of address 91
(b) By itself or with ὦ 91
(c) Nominative forms 91
(d) The article with the vocative 92
(e) But really vocatives 92

5. The accusative 92
(a) The name ambiguous 92
(b) The oldest case 92
(c) Root idea of 93
(d) Originally somewhat vague use 93
(e) Retention in the vernacular 93
(f) Analytic study a convenience 94
(g) With verbs of motion 94
(h) Extension of space 94
(i) Duration of time 94
(j) With transitive verbs 94
(k) Inner object or content 95
(l) Two or more accusatives 95
(m) With passive verbs 96
(n) Without a verb 97
(o) With the infinitive 97
(p) Accusative absolute 97
(q) With prepositions 98

6. The genitive 98
(a) Genitive and ablative same ending in Greek 98
(b) Wrong name for genitive 98
(c) Increase in use 99
(d) Resultant idea varies 99
(e) With substantives 99
(1) Local use 99
(2) Expressions of time 100
(3) Possession 100
(4) Identity 101
(5) Partitive sense probably ablative 101
(6) Subjective or objective 101
(7) The meaning of the word specifies 101
(8) Position of the genitive 101
(9) Several genitives together 101
(f) With adjectives 102
(g) With adverbs and prepositions 102

(h) With verbs 102
(1) Predicate genitive 102
(2) Verbs of sensation 102
(3) Verbs of anxiety 103
(4) Verbs of more objective meaning 103
(5) Genitive absolute 103
7. The ablative 104
(a) The case of separation or source 104
(b) Ablative with adjectives 104
(c) With adverbs and prepositions 105
(d) With verbs 105
8. The locative 105
(a) Space 106
(b) Time 107
(c) Without and with ἐν 107
(d) With other prepositions 107
(e) Pregnant construction of ἐν and εἰς 108
9. The instrumental case 108
(a) Expressions of time 109
(b) Association or accompaniment 109
(c) Words of likeness 109
(d) Manner 109
(e) Cause or ground 110
(f) Means or instrument 110
(g) Measure 110
(h) Two prepositions with 110
10. The dative 111
(a) Indirect object of verbs 112
(b) Direct object of some verbs 112
(c) With intransitive verbs 112
(d) Possession 112
(e) Ethical dative 112
(f) Dative of the agent 113
(g) With substantives 113
(h) Infinitives in the dative 113
(i) Sometimes the case is ambiguous 113

Chapter XV.—Prepositions 115
1. Reasons for use of 115
2. What are prepositions 115
3. So-called improper prepositions 116
4. Cases with prepositions 117
5. Proper method of studying 118

6 Ἀμφί 118
7. Ἀνά 118
8. Ἀντί 118
9. Ἀπό 119
10. διά 119
11. ἐν 119
12. εἰς 120
13. ἐκ 121
14. ἐπί 121
15. κατά 121
16. μετά 121
17. παρά 122
18. περί 122
19. πρό 122
20. πρός 123
21. σύν 123
22. ὑπέρ 123
23. ὑπό 124

Chapter XVI.—General Remarks about the Verb. 125
1. The name not distinctive 125
2. The function of the verb 125
3. The two types of verbs 125
4. Infinitive and participle not pure verbs 125
5. How the verb is made 126
6. Specific idea in each process 126
7. Aktionsart 126
8. Simultaneous development of mode, voice, tense 126
9. Variations in different verbs 127
10. Survival of the fittest 127
11. Probable order 127

Chapter XVII.—The Modes 128
1. Use of ἄν with the modes 128
2. What is mode? 128
3. Positive Statement—indicative 129
4. Doubtful statement—subjunctive and optative 129
5. Commanding statement—imperative 131

Chapter XVIII.—The Voices 133
1. What is voice? 133
2. Names of the voices 133
3. Voice not transitive nor intransitive 133

4. Active voice 133
5. Middle voice 134
6. Passive voice 134
7. History of middle and passive 134
8. The term deponent 135

Chapter XIX.—The Tenses 136
1. The name 136
2. Fundamental idea 136
3. Three ideas as to duration of action 136
4. Greek standpoint in tense 137
5. Indefinite action—aorist 137
6. Incompleted action 139
(a) The present 140
(b) The imperfect 141
(c) The future 141
7. Completed action (present perfect, past perfect, future perfect) 143
(a) The present perfect 144
(b) The past perfect 145
(c) The future perfect 146

Chapter XX.—Co-ordinate and subordinate Clauses. Conjunctions 147
1. What is a sentence? 147
2. The simple sentence 147
3. Co-ordination of clauses 147
4. Contrast by conjunctions 148
5. Disjunctive conjunctions 148
6. Inferential conjunctions 149
7. Subordinating conjunctions 149
8. Modes, tenses, voices in subordinate sentences 150
9. Character of subordinate clauses 150
10. Connection between sentences and paragraphs 151

Chapter XXI.—Final Clauses 152
1. Pure final clauses—adverbial 152
2. Final conjunctions 152
3. Non-final clauses 152
4. Other methods for expressing design 153
5. Absence of the principal verb 154
6. Absence of ἵνα 154

Chapter XXII.—Clauses of Result 155
1. Meager development in Greek 155

2. Ὥστε and the indicative 155
3. Infinitive with ὥστε 155
4. Use of ὥστε at beginning of sentences 155
5. Origin of ὥστε 155
6. Infinitive alone not consecutive 155
7. Ἐφ' ᾧτε not in the New Testament 156
8. Use of ὡς 156
9. Use of ὅτι 156
10. Use of relative 156

Chapter XXIII.—Wishes 157
1. Not verbs of wishing 157
2. Ὄφελον 157
3. Past wish 157
4. Present wish 157
5. Future wish 157
6. Future wish and command 157
7. The so-called potential optative 157
8. Courtesy of the imperfect tense 157

Chapter XXIV.—Causal Sentences 159
1. Use of γάρ 159
2. Ὅτι and διότι 159
3. Ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, and ἐπειδήπερ 159
4. Ἐφ' ὅσον 159
5. Καθότι 159
6. Infinitive with διά 160
7. Causal participle 160
8. Relative with idea of cause 160
9. Ἀνθ' ὧν, διό, etc. 160

Chapter XXV.—Conditional Sentences 161
1. General remarks 161
2. First class condition determined as fulfilled 161
3. Second class condition determined as unfulfilled 162
4. Third class condition undeterminal with expectation of fulfillment 163
5. Fourth class condition undetermined with little expectation of fulfillment 164
6. Mixed conditions 165
7. Participle as a protasis 165
8. Elliptical conditions 166

9. Conditions in indirect discourse 166
10. Concessive clauses 167
11. Negative in the protasis 167

Chapter XXVI.—Relative Clauses 168
1. Function of the relative with clauses 168
2. Two kinds of relative clauses, adjectival and adverbial 168
3. Relative adverbs 168
4. Mode in the relative clause 168
5. Definite and indefinite relatives 168
6. The so-called "conditional" relative 169
7. Use of ἄν in relative clauses 169
8. Negative of the relative clause 170
9. Relative of design or result 170
10. Use of ἐάν with relatives 170

Chapter XXVII.—Temporal Clauses 171
1. List of temporal conjunctions 171
2. The group with sense of until and before 171
(a) Ἄχρι 171
(b) Ἕως 171
(c) Μέχρι 172
(d) Πρίν 172
(e) Πρὸ τοῦ and infinitive 172
(f) Ἐν ᾧ 172
(g) Ἀφ' οὗ 173
3. Other constructions 173
(a) Ἡνίκα 173
(b) Ἐπεί 173
(c) Ὁπότε 173
(d) Ὅτε and ὅταν 173
(e) Ὡς 173
(f) Ὅσον, etc. 174
(g) Μετὰ τό and infinitive 174
4. Participles with temporal idea 174

Chapter XXVIII.—Comparative Clauses 175
1. Inadequate treatment 175
2. Καθό, καθά, καθάπερ 175
3. Καθότι 175
4. Ὅσος 175
5. Ὡς, καθώς, καθώσπερ, ὥσπερ, ὡσεί, ὡσπερεί 175

Chapter XXIX.—Interrogative Sentences 177
1. Mark of interrogation 177
2. The modes of direct questions 177
3. Kind of answer expected 177
4. Interrogative pronouns used 178
5. Confusion between interrogative and relative pronouns 178
6. Interrogative conjunctions 179
7. Elliptical phrases like ἵνα τί, τί ὅτι, εἰ 179
8. Alternative questions 179
9. Exclamations 179
10. Interjections 179

Chapter XXX.—Indirect Discourse 181
1. Direct discourse more common 181
2. Tensé as a rule unchanged 181
3. Person of the verb may be changed 181
4. The mode may be changed 182
5. Three kinds of indirect discourse 182
6. Indirect assertions 182
(a) The construction with the infinitive 182
(b) The construction with ὅτι 183
(c) The construction with the participle 184
(d) The construction with καὶ ἐγένετο 184
7. Indirect questions 185
(a) The tense as a rule unchanged 185
(b) The indicative mode 185
(c) The subjunctive mode 185
(d) The optative mode 185
(e) Indirect deliberative questions 185
(f) The article with the indirect question 186
(g) The infinitive (?) 186
8. Indirect commands 186
(a) The infinitive 186
(b) Conjunctions 186
(c) Indirect deliberative question 186
9. Mixture of direct and indirect discourse 186
10. The subordinate clause 186

Chapter XXXI.—The Infinitive 187
1. Origin of the infinitive 187
2. Idea of the infinitive in Greek 187
3. History of the infinitive 187
4. The article with the infinitive 188

5. Cases of the infinitive 188
6. Common use of τοῦ and the infinitive 189
7. The infinitive with verbs 189
8. The infinitive with prepositions 189
9. The infinitive in indirect discourse 190
10. The infinitive limited in use by ὅτι and ἵνα 191
11. The infinitive for purpose 191
12. Ὥστε and the infinitive 191
13. The negative of the infinitive 191
14. The periphrastic infinitive 192
15. The voices of the infinitive 192
16. The tenses of the infinitive 192
17. Προσέθετο and the infinitive 192

Chapter XXXII.—The Participle 193
1. Most perfect development in Greek 193
2. A verbal adjective 193
3. Other verbal adjectives 193
4. Differences between participle and infinitive 194
5. Participle and the article, attributive 194
6. Predicate participle 195
7. Supplementary participle 195
8. Circumstantial participle 195
9. Genitive absolute 196
10. Participle in LXX for Hebrew infinitive absolute 196
11. Adjuncts with the circumstantial participle 197
12. Participle in indirect discourse 197
13. Voice in the participle 197
14. Tense in the participle 197
15. Negative of the participle 198
16. Participle as a substantive 198

Chapter XXXIII.—Negative Particles 199
1. Two negatives in Greek 199
2. New Testament idiom 199
3. With the imperative 199
4. With the subjunctive 200
5. With the optative 200
6. With the infinitive 200
7. With the participle 201
8. With the indicative 201
(a) Declarative sentences 201

(b) Casual sentences 201
(c) Conditional sentences 201
(d) Relative sentences 202
(e) Clauses of purpose 202
(f) Verbs of fearing 202
(g) Questions 202
(h) Prohibitions 202
(i) Indirect discourse 203
(j) Succession of negatives 203
(k) When the second negative is a single negative 203
(l) Οὐ μή 203
(m) Redundant negative 203
(n) Οὐχί 204
(o) Οὐχ ὅτι 204
Chapter XXXIV.—Intensive Particles 205
1. The term particle 205
2. Origin of intensive particles 205
3. Frequency in Greek 205
4. Γέ 205
5. Πέρ 206
6. Δή 206
7. Τοί 206
8. Μέν 206
9. Ναί 206
10. Νή 207
Chapter XXXV.—Figures of Speech 208
1. Not peculiar to Greek 208
2. The Apocalypse 208
3. Leading types of figures 208
4. Rhythm 209
5. Periods 209
6. Position of words 209

PART I.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE MODERN METHOD OF LINGUISTIC STUDY.

1. There is a modern method. The old way treated the New Testament Greek as a thing apart, a peculiar kind of Greek like nothing else on land or sea, a religious dialect alone fit for the expression of Christian truth. The term "Biblical Greek" used to be the right way to define the special type of Greek found in the LXX. and the New Testament. The modern method seeks to study the language of the New Testament as a part of a greater whole, not as an isolated phenomenon. The old Purist controversy as to whether the Greek of the New Testament was exactly like the "Classic" Greek or possessed many Hebraisms long ago lost its interest, but a new turn to the whole matter has come.

2. The evolutionary principle has its application to language also. Each member of the Indo-Germanic group has a common basis with the rest. Several of these languages have very vital connection. Comparative philology therefore is an essential aid to the modern student of the New Testament Greek. Some knowledge of comparative grammar can be obtained from any of the numerous handbooks on the subject. The Greek is not a tongue entirely to itself. Sanskrit, Latin, and other languages throw much light upon the development of Greek.

3. The Greek itself is a unit and needs to be looked at as a whole. It has had a long and wonderful history, but the language heard on the streets of Athens to-day is in all essentials the same that Aristophanes reports in his comedies. Indeed modern Greek differs no more from the Greek of Homer than the English of Tennyson from the Anglo-Saxon of King Alfred. The various dialects all need to be considered and they can be compared with the dialects of English. Greek is a term wide enough to include Homer

and Sophocles, Herodotus and Thucydides, Plato and Plutarch, Demosthenes and Paul, John and Tricoupis. Greek is not dead. Language has a history and can only be understood rightly by a long view of its whole career.

4. The older grammars gave the literary Attic as the basis of the Greek New Testament and left out of view all the other dialects save in footnotes. Even the later Attic was given scant justice, while the vernacular came in for little consideration. The vernacular language has received better treatment in recent years in the modern grammars. Scholars are now seeing that it is the stream of the spoken language that has persisted. Modern Greek vernacular needs to be compared with the ancient Greek vernacular in order to get the right line of development. The literary language is always more or less artificial and aloof from the life of the people. Language is life and must be so studied, if one is to catch its secrets.

5. The office of the grammarian is therefore to register and to interpret facts, not to manufacture or warp the facts to a theory. The novice in the study of syntax has difficulty in ridding his mind of the idea that grammars and dictionaries regulate a language. They merely interpret a language more or less correctly as the case may be. The seat of authority in language is not the books about language, but the people who speak and write it. The usage of the best educated writers determines the literary style of a language, while the whole people determine the vernacular. Change in language cannot be stopped save by the death of the language.

6. The genius of the Greek language itself must constantly be sought. It is easy to explain a Greek idiom by the English or the German. This is the vice of many grammars. The Greek must be allowed to be itself and have its own point of view. Good Greek may be very poor English and *vice versa*. It is imperative for a just and sympathetic appreciation of Greek to look at the language from the Greek standpoint. The consistent application of this principle will prevent one from explaining one preposition as used "instead" of another, one tense "for" another, etc.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS THE GREEK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT?

1. We are at last in a position to answer this question properly. The difficulty was always largely an artificial one due to the preconceived ideas and lack of due perspective in the use of the known facts. But the new papyri discoveries in Egypt (Fayum, Oxyrhynchus, etc.) have shed a flood of light on the subject. The inscriptions of Asia Minor especially add much information as to the vernacular *κοινή*. Even the *ostraka* have a deal to tell about the language of the people. Dr. Deissmann, of Heidelberg, and Dr. J. H. Moulton, of Manchester, have been the first to apply the new knowledge to the New Testament Greek. They have done it with brilliant success. Dr. Petrie, of London, and Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, of Oxford, have been the chief modern explorers in the Egyptian papyri, but now many scholars like Mayser, Voelker, etc., are busy in this grammatical field. The free use of *ἐν*, for instance, appears in the papyri as in the N. T.

2. The main point that is made clear is one that was known in a way before. It is that the New Testament is written in the vernacular Greek of the time. There are indeed literary influences here and there (especially in the writings of Luke, Paul, and in Hebrews), but as a whole the New Testament books represent the spoken tongue, though not of illiterate men by any means, unless some such traces be discernible in 2 Peter and Revelation. There is thus a note of reality and vividness in the New Testament not usually present in books in the formal literary style.

3. The Modern Greek vernacular shows a steady line of development from the New Testament vernacular. A backward light is thus thrown that is helpful in many ways. The common stream of the spoken speech flows on.

4. The Greek of the New Testament that was used with practical uniformity over most of the Roman world is called the Common Greek or κοινή. Not that it was not good Greek, but rather the Greek in common use. There was indeed a literary κοινή and a vernacular κοινή. Plutarch is a good specimen of the literary κοινή while the papyri are chiefly in the vernacular κοινή like most of the New Testament.

5. This κοινή was itself the heir of the past. The various Greek dialects blended on an Attic base. The κοινή was thus richer in expression as to words and forms than any of the older dialects. Compare the relation of the modern English to the various tongues that have contributed to its power and expansion. Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, North West Greek and other dialects have made some contribution to the common result. The use of nominatives in the midst of accusatives in the Boeotian, for instance, is strangely like the Book of Revelation. So the absence of the future participle is like the N. T.

6. The New Testament Greek is not translation Greek and thus differs radically in most respects from the LXX. which shows the Hebrew idiom at every turn. The New Testament in general contains books composed freely in the vernacular κοινή. But there are traces of such translation influences in the numerous quotations from the LXX. and the Hebrew as well as in the possible Aramaic original of Matthew and the discourses of Jesus in general, though Jesus himself probably spoke both Greek and Aramaic. Luke in his Gospel and the Acts may have had Aramaic (or even Hebrew) sources (written or oral) for part of his information. Compare the opening chapters in both books. But in general the New Testament stands on a very different plane from the LXX. as to its language, though like it in many idioms.

7. Still some Hebrew and Aramaic influence is perceived in the New Testament. But the Semitic influence is nothing like so much as was once supposed. Both the Purists and the Hebraists were wrong. One can no longer explain every variation from the classic literary style by calling it a Hebraism, when the same thing is common in the papyri of Egypt. As compared with the whole

the Semitic influence is not very great, though it is real and definite. The readers were most of them Jews and all were familiar with the Hebrew O. T. and the LXX and their writings bear marks of this knowledge in various ways. In Lu. 20:12 προσέθετο πέμψαι is like the Hebrew. Compare Ex. *14:13*.

8. The Latin influence is very slight indeed, consisting of some 30 words like κεντυρίων and a few phrases. Rome had her soldiers and her laws in Palestine and the trace of that fact is left in the New Testament.

9. Christianity itself has made a definite contribution to the language of the New Testament. In so far as the gospel has new ideas to set forth, a new turn has to be given to old words like κηρύσσω or a new word comes into use like καλο-διδάσκαλος (Tit. 2:3). But the papyri have taught us to be chary about ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. Certainly as a rule the New Testament took the language of the time made ready to hand and put the Christian content into this earthen vessel.

10. There are indeed diversities of gifts. Each writer of the New Testament has his own style and angle of vision, a style that changes to some extent in each case with change of theme, age, and character of composition. On this subject see Simcox, Writers of the New Testament. This is all natural and can be illustrated in individual cases by the variety in the same writer as Shakespeare, Milton, etc. All things considered, now that we know much of the facts about the Greek of the New Testament, it is just what we had a right to expect, knowing what we do of God's method of work. This is in brief the kind of tongue in which was given to men the greatest collection of books in all the world, the New Testament.

PART II.

FORMS.

CHAPTER III.

ORTHOGRAPHY, ACCENT, PRONUNCIATION, PUNCTUATION.

1. *Orthography.*—It is not an easy matter to determine the principles by which to settle the problems of New Testament orthography. There is first the question of text, for the manuscripts differ widely.

(a) In the matter of spelling the usual principles of external evidence do not easily apply. We cannot always appeal to the Neutral class, say, as against the Western, or the Pre-Syrian classes against the Syrian, though sometimes we may. Thus the Syrian class uniformly reads Καπερναούμ, not Καφαρναούμ. Scribes would have difference of opinion about spelling. So Aleph prefers ι rather than ει, while B is fond of ει and not ι. Moreover the scribe is under the constant temptation to correct the spelling in his document by the spelling of his day. It is hard to be sure that a fourth century document gives us the first century spelling. Then again the scribe was not always a competent judge and could also fall a victim to itacism and confuse vowels and diphthongs that were at that time pronounced alike. The tendency in the later Greek to blend so many vowels and diphthongs into the ι sound is an instance. Thus ει, ι, η, ῃ, υ, υι, οι could be confused, and ε and αι, ο and ω. Many forms in εω were shortened to ω as λογία, ἐριθία.

(b) The final ν of σύν is usually retained unchanged as in συνπάσχω, though not always as in συγγενής. With ἐν the ν is generally assimilated as ἐμβάλλω, but we have ἐνκρίνω. Movable ν before vowels is uniformly in harmony with Greek usage, but this movable ν is very common also before consonants, though not always present, as πᾶσιν τοῖς κτλ (Matt. 5:15). Westcott and Hort have οὕτως before a consonant 196 times and οὕτω only 10 times. So οὕτως καὶ κτλ (Matt. 17:12). The manuscripts differ as to the use of double consonants as ἀρραβών or ἀραβών (2 Cor. 1:22).

(c) Elision is somewhat arbitrary. It is much more rare than in the earlier Greek. The hiatus was not considered so objectionable after the manner of the Ionian writers. Dr. Hort says that "elision takes place habitually and without variation before pronouns and participles; also before nouns of frequent occurrence, as ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, κατ' οἶκον. In other cases there is much diversity, and occasional variation" (p. 146 of Appendix to Vol. II. of New Testament in Greek).

(d) Crasis is rare and καί is the most usual example, especially before ἐγώ, ἄν, ἐκεῖνος, ἐκεῖ, so κἀμοί in Lu. 1:3, though καὶ ἐγὼ in Lu. 2:48.

(e) Contraction is in general in harmony with the older Attic Greek, though the Ionic influence is again perceived in such forms as ὀρέων (Rev. 6:16).

(f) The rough breathing occurs sometimes where it is not usual in the older Greek as ἁφίδω (Phil. 2:23) due to the lost digamma or to analogy of ἀφοράω and used occasionally in the earlier vernacular (Mullach, Meisterhans). Such examples are common in the papyri. So some documents read ἀφελπίζοντες in Lu. 6:35 (cf. ἀφηλπικώς in Hermas). Westcott and Hort accept ἐφ' ἐλπίδι in Rom. 8:20, and good manuscripts give οὐχ ὀλίγος in Acts 12:18. The breathings were not written in the manuscripts till long after New Testament times save when the aspiration showed in the consonant. At this period of the language there was an increase in aspiration, though in the modern Greek the reverse is seen, for the aspirate is not pronounced. Compare the confusion as to h in the usage of the English cockney.

(g) The prothetic vowel disappears in ἐθέλω (John 5:21), but always ἤθελον (Gal. 4:20).

(h) In proper names sometimes the Hebrew is merely transliterated as in Δανείδ, while with other names an effort is made to make a Greek word out of it as in Ζαχαρίας, but the manuscripts often vary in such matters.

(i) The papyri give us a good deal of help as to orthography though it is to be remembered that many of the documents preserved in the papyri are written by uneducated people and hence

do not fairly represent the usage of the time. This is true of the New Testament manuscripts. Even A B have χεῖραν, a double accusative ending, in John 20:25, and many of the papyri show this form (Moulton, Characteristics of N. T. Greek, Expositor, May, 1904). So Dr. Moulton argues as to the accusative μείζων rather than μείζω, which some documents have in John 5:36. Likewise he holds that, while good uncials have πλήρης as indeclinable like papyri from the second century on, it is more likely that in John 1:14 the manuscripts have changed πλήρη to πλήρης to suit later usage. As previously noted ἐάν and ἄν are often interchanged in the later κοινή. Τέσσερα, however, though common in the New Testament, is unusual in the papyri, but λήμψομαι is pretty uniform after the Ptolemaic period.

2. *Accent.*—This is a thorny subject.

(a) It is not long since the Greek scholar affected a scorn of accent and scattered his accents about promiscuously or not at all. Even now it is not uncommon to see woful slips in modern books that use Greek. But "In England, at all events, every man will accent his Greek properly who wishes to stand well with the world." (Chandler, Greek Accentuation, p. xxiii).

(b) However, when we come to ask what is the proper accentuation for Greek words, we are at once in trouble. We only know the facts from the manuscripts and the grammars. The early Greek manuscripts give no accents at all, but were written in uncial letters without breaks between words. People were supposed to know the accent and the breathings, as was the case with the Hebrew vowel points. So in Latin and modern English no accents occur written on the words, though, of course, accent itself exists. At best the manuscripts give the accent of their day as they have received it. In the vernacular there would be a persistence in accent with inevitable changes at various points. The ancient Greeks were as sensitive to a mispronounced word as an educated audience now in all lands. We know how the modern Greek uses accent, but can not feel sure about the ancient accent at all points.

(c) We cannot trace the history of accent from Homer to the

time of the Greek grammarians, but Aristophanes of Byzantium is credited with the written system of accents about 200 B. C.

(d) We are troubled again as to the significance of the accent. Was it only elevation of the voice? or does it also include stress? Does it make the accented syllable long? This last is practically the result in modern Greek, but does not seem to be true of the earlier times. But both elevation and stress seem to be gradually included in accent though this is doubtful as to stress. Voice-pitch was the original value of accent. It is not possible to lay down formal rules for Greek accent save in a general way. Sometimes contrast is represented by the accent, as we say out'side, in'side. So Greek τί or τὶ. There is also emphasis in accent and accent often is determined by euphony. But one remark can be made with confidence. The word should receive the accent in reading where the accent is. This truism is not without point if one hears Greek read aloud.

(e) The New Testament does not seem to vary greatly in accent from the earlier Greek, but we must remember our lack of information for both sources. The difference between verb forms is still shown by the accent as βάπτισαι (Acts 22:16). But Westcott and Hort print ἴδε both where the verb force is retained (ἰδέ in Attic, cf. Rom. 11:22) and where the word is only an interjection (Mark 11:21). Proclitics occur without accent as ἐκ, εἰς. Enclitics are used as in earlier Greek though sometimes the enclitic word has some emphasis as τινα in Acts 5:36. Πρὸς ἐμέ is rare (Acts 22:8), but πρός με is common (Matt. 3:14) though in this passage a number of manuscripts have πρὸς μέ (cf. LXX). Sometimes the accent is vital to the sense as τῷ (not τῳ) in 1 Cor. 15:8. Indeclinable proper names are often accented on the last syllable as Βηθσαιδά. There is generally recessive accent in proper names Τύχικος, but Χριστός retains the accent of the verbal.

3. *Pronunciation.*—We refer now to the sounds of the vowels and the consonants, for in a true sense accent is an element in pronunciation.

(a) How did the New Testament writers pronounce their vowels and consonants? To answer this question correctly we must

answer another one. Do the modern Greeks preserve the ancient pronunciation? Many of them think so. It is an amusing story told in Blass's Pronunciation of Ancient Greek, (Purton's translation, 1890,) how Stephen Gardiner, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, proposed in 1542 to refuse a degree to and expel from the Senate all who did not pronounce αι and ε alike and who distinguished in sound between οι, ει, and ι. It was a grievous heresy that Erasmus had introduced! Now Chancellor Gardiner had received the pronunciation of Greek as it had come to Western Europe from the Byzantine scholars during the Renaissance. But they had brought their own pronunciation of Greek, not that of the ancients.

(b) Master Erasmus was mainly right though the dialects are partly against him. The ancient Greeks did not as a rule pronounce αι and ε alike. Most of them did distinguish between οι, ει, ι, υι, υ, η, ῃ. They did not all of them pronounce β as υ nor δ as th. The modern Greek represents the b sound by μπ and the d sound by ντ. The aspirate was usually pronounced by the ancients, as ἐφ' ἵππων proves. Hadley (Essays Philological and Critical, p. 140,) shows a wide difference in pronunciation between the Greek of the tenth and the nineteenth centuries. Moreover, we can trace the changes as far back as the manuscripts go. But even among the earlier Boeotians these changes were already going on, for they wrote τῦς ἄλλυς for τοῖς ἄλλοις. Z is already losing the δ sound in the New Testament and becoming merely in effect our z. It is certain then that the New Testament Greek was not pronounced exactly like the modern Greek, but much more like the vernacular Attic of the time of Demosthenes. The vernacular inscriptions of the various early Greek dialects show much diversity in pronunciation and spelling. But some of the tendencies of modern Greek were already manifest in the κοινή.

4. *Punctuation.*—Punctuation is the function of the modern editor, for the Greek manuscripts had the words all written together. Paragraphs were not separated till late, though rough chapter divisions are early discernible. Punctuation is the result of interpretation. The ancients were wholly without our modern conven-

ience in this respect. See change of place of the period in the phrase ἓν ὃ γέγονεν in John 1:3. Westcott and Hort pointed it ἕν. ὃ γέγονεν κτλ. See also in John 7:21 the place of the period with διὰ τοῦτο. As a rule German editors punctuate too freely according to German ideas rather than those of the Greeks. The scarcity of writing material made it important to utilize all the space. The student of the New Testament to-day has many conveniences that Timothy did not enjoy when he gave himself to the reading of Paul's Epistles and the other Scriptures. We need the dash in his Epistles at times (2 Tim. 4:15 f.) because of the vehement emotion. Often a parenthesis is called for in the Scripture text (John 1:15), especially in Paul's Epistles.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DECLENSION OF SUBSTANTIVES.

1. *The history of the Greek declensions.*

(a) Nouns (both substantives and adjectives) have three declensions in Greek, though the distinction between them is not easily made. In Sanskrit Whitney finds five declensions, as in Latin, but says: "There is nothing absolute in this arrangement; it is merely believed to be open to as few objections as any other. No general agreement has been reached among scholars as to the number and order of Sanskrit declensions" (Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, p. 111). There is pretty general agreement among Greek scholars as to the number of declensions, but not as to the reason for the divisions. The first and second declensions do have vowel stems and differ in one having α and the other ο stems, but the third declension is not wholly a consonant declension for some of the stems show no trace of a final consonant, not even of a lost digamma as πόλι-ς, ἄστυ. They do differ in this respect that the genitive singular of the third declension has always the added suffix -ος, but even in this matter the first and second declensions are in harmony.

(b) Moreover, while the modern Greek preserves fairly well the third declension with many variations as to the case endings, it has in the vernacular a supplementary declension that has a vowel stem in the singular and a consonant stem in the plural and combines thus the first or second and the third declensions, as παπᾶς, παπάδες. This form of metaplasm is found in the earlier Greek. In the modern vernacular Greek it has won a fixed place. The New Testament shows a number of examples of such change from the second declension to the third, as σαββάτῳ (Luke 14:1), but σάββασιν (Matt. 12:1). So likewise we have ὁ πλοῦτος (Eph. 1:18)

and τὸ πλοῦτος (Eph. 1:8). The change from the first declension to the third is rare, but ἡ νίκη (1 John 5:4) becomes τὸ νίκος in 1. Cor. 15:55. In ἑκατοντάρχῃ (Matt. 8:13) we have the first declension, but in ἑκατόνταρχον (Acts 22:25) the second. So we have Λύστραν (Acts 14:6) and Λύστροις (Acts 14:8). But the declensions preserve their integrity well both in the papyri and in the New Testament.

(c) The tendency towards blending the case forms that is so strong in the Indo-germanic tongues served to some extent to obliterate still more the distinctions between the declensions. But for this matter and the history of the cases see chapter on the Syntax of the Cases. With all the substantives one needs to get the root (primitive or derivative), and the case ending. This science of word-building (German, Wort-bildung) is necessary for the real student of language.

2. *Special forms in the first declension.*

(a) The Ionic genitive-ablative σπείρης in Acts 10:1 is, according to Deissmann, the rule in the papyri, but the modern Greek retains -ας. Note also συνειδυίης in Acts 5:2 and other similar examples. The so-called Doric genitive occurs in the New Testament, as in the papyri and the modern Greek. So we have βορρᾶ (Luke 13:29), but Ἀνδρέου (Mark 1:29). Note also the genitive Μάρθας (John 11:1). There is much confusion in the manuscripts between Μαρία (Matt. 1:16) and Μαριάμ (Matt. 13:55), the latter the Hebrew form and indeclinable, the former the Hellenized declinable form. Dr. Hort contends for Μαριάμ always for the sister of Lazarus. In the New Testament and the later Greek the form -αρχης supplants as a rule -αρχος, as πολιτάρχας (Acts 17:6). Μωυσῆς is Μωυσῆν in accusative, but Μωυσέως (third declension) in the genitive.

(b) The nominative singular of the first declension has no ending for feminine nouns, but ς for masculine stems. The nominative plural is ι for all stems. In Sanskrit the feminine nominative singular has also some derivative stems.

(c) The vocative has no ending for singular or plural, but with nouns in -της the stem vowel is shortened from ᾱ to ᾰ. The San-

skrit has no vocative ending and in *a* stems uses merely the unaltered stem.

(d) The genitive-ablative ending for the singular was *as* in the Sanskrit. It appears in Greek variously as ος, ς, σοιο, οιο, ιο, ο. See numerous examples in Homer. The first declension uses ς for feminine and ιο for masculine nouns. But ιο drops the ι and the ᾱ of the stem combines with ο after ᾱο has become εω under Ionic influence. Attic has an Ionic base. In the Ionic this genitive-ablative appears as εω and in Homer is pronounced as one syllable. The genitive-ablative plural ending ων is the same for all the declensions. In the Sanskrit the genitive plural ending is *am* or *sam* while the ablative has a different ending *bhyas*. The Latin has genitive plural *um* and *orum*. The long a has become ω and m has become ν. This ω contracts with the stem vowel ᾱ making ῶν.

(e) The locative, dative, and instrumental cases have as a rule the same ending in the singular and plural of the first declension. It is the dative form (αι) that is used in the singular of the first declension for all three cases. This αι in the Sanskrit was ai or ê and seems to come from a longer form *-abhi* which occurred in feminine stems. So Sanskrit *tu-bhja* or *tu-bhjam* like Latin tib(h)i and mi(b)hi. This αι contracts with the stem vowel ᾱ (η) into ᾱͅ, ῃ. However a remnant of the original locative singular ending ι occurs as χαμα-ί, though ᾱͅ and ῃ could be explained as locative forms also. The two here easily blend. There are several remains of the instrumental singular ending φι (old Sanskrit *bhi*) in Homer as βίη-φι. But in the Sanskrit singular ᾱ is the instrumental ending due possibly to the union of the old associative case with the instrumental. This ᾱ is preserved in some Greek words like ἄμᾱ, πάντᾱ(η). In the plural these three cases use σι (with phonetic ι preceding, Schleicher), the locative ending, like the Sanskrit *su* and (Giles, p. 289) αις and οις instrumental. The dative, however, in Latin preserves sometimes its own original ending (*bhyas* in Sanskrit) as in dea-bus, capitibus. Homer uses the instrumental plural φιν (in Sanskrit *bhis*, possibly seen in ἀμ-φίς) in such forms as κεφαλῆ-φιν. The old associative plural has no examples left.

(f) The accusative singular has two endings in Greek ν and α.

In the Sanskrit this ending is *am* or *ṃ*, as in the Latin we have *em* or *m* for masculine and feminine stems. But the Greek uses now ν (*m* thus appearing), now α. But in the papyri and in some manuscripts as of the New Testament the vernacular uses both α and ν as in χεῖραν, νύκταν (examples, of course, of the third declension). The vernacular of the modern Greek commonly drops ν entirely. The accusative plural ending is in Greek νς for this declension. The ν disappears, of course, before the ς. The Sanskrit had *ans* with short vowel masculine stems. So the Latin *as* is from *ans*. The Greek third declension, however, like the Sanskrit, uses only ας without ν.

3. *Special forms of the second declension.*

(a) The so-called Attic second declension is almost extinct in the New Testament as it is wholly so in the modern Greek. However, Κῶ as accusative appears in Acts 21:1 and Ἀπολλώ is genitive (1 Cor. 3:4).

(b) Θεός is used as vocative always in New Testament (John 20:28), save in Matt. 27:46 in quotation from Ps. 22:1 where, however, θεός is read. But θεέ occurs a few times in the Septuagint as in Judges 21:3.

(c) The name Ἰησοῦς has Ἰησοῦ for all the oblique cases save the accusative which is Ἰησοῦν.

(d) Ὀστέον is contracted in John 19:36, but uncontracted in plural ὀστέα (Lu. 24:39) and ὀστέων (Matt. 23:27). In Matt. 2:3 Ἱεροσόλυμα is still plural neuter and πᾶσα is used with πόλις not expressed as ἡ is so used with the indeclinable form Ἱερουσαλήμ (Rev. 3:12). Νοῦς has accusative νοῦν (1 Cor. 2:16), but genitive νοός and dative νοί (third declension). See Eph. 4:23.

(e) The second (or ο) declension has no distinctively feminine inflection as in the first (or α) declension. However, feminine words like ὁδός occur with the masculine endings. The variations in inflection between this declension and the masculine stems of the first declension are several. The genitive-ablative singular ου is the result of the contraction of οιο after ι has been dropped. But Homer often keeps it as -οιο. The original ablative ending in the Sanskrit singular was t or d and appears in οὐρανό-θε and the ad-

verbial -ως(τ). So Latin tus (*caelitus*), Umbrian tu (out of), Anglo-Saxon ut (out of). The genitive-ablative plural ending ων is not contracted with ο of the stem, but the ο has been dropped. In the locative, instrumental, dative cases the ending for the singular is αι which contracts with ο of the stem into ῳ. Some distinctively locative forms occur, however, as οἴκο-ι (compare dative form οἴκῳ). The locative, instrumental, dative plural has the locative ending ισι appearing usually as ις and the instr. οις. Homer often has ισι and sometimes the Attic. Homer also has the instrumental ending in θεόφιν. The accusative plural ους is made from ο-νς. The ν is dropped before ς and the ο has compensative lengthening. In the Doric this lengthening is often into ως, not ους. In the vocative singular the stem vowel ο has been changed with no ending after the manner of the Sanskrit (a to e), though the vocative is not strictly a case. The neuter declension is just like the masculine with the exception that in the singular the nominative, vocative, and accusative are just alike and have the ending ν like the *m* of the Latin. In the Sanskrit neuters in general had no ending at all for the nominative and *am* with pronouns is a frequent masculine and feminine nominative ending. Some Sanskrit neuters (tat) show a form in d like Latin istud and English that. In the Sanskrit the ending for neuter nominative is i and the same for the accusative and the vocative. But *an*, *in*, *un* were sometimes prefixed to this i and then the *ni* dropped, leaving *a*, *i*, *u*. The Greek and the Latin use this a for the neuter plural. In the second declension in the Greek this α displaces ο of the stem and there is no contraction.

4. *Special forms of the third declension.*

(a) The vocative plural is always the same as the nominative, but the vocative singular varies greatly. It is either like the nom. as κῆρυξ, ποιμήν, or the stem as δαῖμον, πόλι. In Mk. 5:34 θυγάτηρ, not θύγατερ in the vocative form, i. e., the nominative form is retained, but θύγατερ in Matt. 9:22. So πάτερ in Jo. 17:1, but πατήρ in 17:21, and even πατὴρ δίκαιε in 17:25. These are examples without the article.

(b) Κλεῖς has accusative singular κλεῖδα (Luke 11:52) and κλεῖν

Saint Dominic College Library
St. Charles, Illinois

(Rev. 3:7), both κλεῖδας (Matt. 16:19) and κλεῖς (Rev. 1:18) as accusative plural. Χάρις has usually accusative singular χάριν (Heb. 4:16), but χάριτα occurs twice (Acts 24:27; Jude 4). Γραμματεῖς, not γραμματέας, is the accusative plural (Matt. 23:34). This form is found in the earlier Greek, in the papyri, and is the form in the modern Greek. On the other hand ἰχθύας, not ἰχθῦς is the accusative plural (Matt. 14:17). Κέρας has κέρατα, not κέρᾱ (Rev. 5:6). The masculine and feminine accusative singular uses α generally, though the close vowel stems, like the open vowel stems (α and ο declensions), use ν (πόλιν, ναῦν). But Βασιλεύς and words like it have α, and still use it in the modern Greek. The noticeable tendency in the vernacular of the κοινή to use both α and ν, as in χεῖραν, did not succeed and was due largely to the ignorant classes. Cf. N. W. Greek. The accusative plural for these genders is generally ᾶς, but some have νς like ναῦς. In some words also the accusative is like the nominative (cf. the Latin *es*) as πόλεις, βασιλεῖς.

(c) The genitive plural ὀρέων is uncontracted sometimes (Rev. 6:15). Σολομών has genitive Σολομῶντος in Acts 3:11, though usually Σολομῶνος (Matt. 12:42). The third declension could easily be divided into two or more and thus we should have the five of the Sanskrit and the Latin. But all the usual seven divisions of the third declension unite in forming the genitive-ablative cases in the singular with ος like Sanskrit *as* and Latin *is*. There is contraction in some forms when the consonant is dropped as with γένους (Phil. 3:5). But with words like βασιλεύς ος appears as ως. This may be due to the dropping of digamma and the lengthening of one vowel. In Homer we have βασιλῆος where ε, and not ο, is lengthened. A similar phenomenon is observable with πόλις, πόλεως, in Homer πόληος, where an ε has been inserted and ι dropped. Observe also the acute accent remains on the antepenult because originally πόλεως was pronounced as two syllables. Schleicher thinks that this ως may be rather like the Sanskrit *as*. The genitive-ablative plural πόλεων likewise retains the acute accent on the antepenult for a similar reason, and the ων does not contract with the inserted ε. As already observed contraction does not always occur in the genitive-ablative plural with forms like χειλέων.

(d) Perhaps it is in the nominative singular that the forms of the third declension vary most. Neuters, of course, will be the mere stem for nominative, accusative, and vocative singular, if the last letter is a consonant that can stand at the end of a word. If not, the letter is simply dropped as in σῶμα(τ). But some neuters instead of this change the consonant in these cases, or originally had both, as κέρας(τ), ὕδωρ(ατ). Or else the final ς is retained and the last vowel changed as γένος(ες). Neuter plurals for these cases have always simply α. Many masculine and feminine substantives have the usual ς as the nominative ending with necessary euphonic changes as ἐλπίς. Others have the mere stem as αἰών. Still others have the stem with lengthened vowel as ποιμήν or γέρων(τ). In the modern Greek a curious nominative is made from the accusative singular as ἡ εἰκόνα. The nominative plural (masculine and feminine) is always ες, sometimes contracted with preceding ε (stem as βασιλεῖς or added as πόλεις).

(e) The locative, instrumental, dative cases have in the singular the locative ending ι without any exceptions. Sometimes contraction takes place as with γένει, πόλει. In the plural these cases use the locative ending σι always.

5. *Number in substantives.*

(a) The dual is no longer used in the New Testament, nor does it occur in the Septuagint, except in the form δύο itself, which is indeclinable save that the form δυσί (plural locative ending) is found (Lu. 16:13). But this form appears in Aristotle, and is common in the papyri, where we see also (Deissmann, Bible Studies) δύω, δυῶν, δυεῖν. Ἄμφω does not appear in the New Testament, but only ἀμφότεροι and this sometimes apparently for more than two (Acts 19:16). The dual was never used largely in the Greek (Ionic dropped it before the time of κοινή) and in the modern Greek is wholly disused. It is a logical effort to distinguish pairs of things, as the two eyes. The Sanskrit employed it, but Latin had only duo and ambo which had a plural inflection in the oblique cases.

(b) Some words are only used in the singular from the nature of the case, and some again only in the plural. Sometimes the

plural is used to avoid being too definite as with οἱ ζητοῦντες (Matt. 2:20), or again the word may be adverbial (accusative of general reference) as ἴσα (Phil. 2:6).

(c) Neuter plurals often use verbs in the singular being looked at as a single whole as τὰ ἔργα--- μαρτυρεῖ (John 10:25), but not always as τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα--- κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται (1 Tim. 5:25). Here the items are emphasized. A singular substantive may have a collective idea and so be used with a plural verb as ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν (Matt. 21:8).

6. *Gender of substantives.*

(a) The noun Ἄγαρ (Gal. 4:25) is not used as neuter with τὸ mistakenly by Paul. He treats the name as a word. Any word can be thus treated as neuter in Greek and the neuter article can be so employed. In Rom. 11:4 Paul uses ἡ βάαλ as we have sometimes in the Septuagint, perhaps because of the idea of αἰσχύνη attributed to Baal. Compare also the use of ἡ with Ἱεροσόλυμα (Matt. 2:3) evidently with the idea of πόλις.

(b) Any noun used for a male is masculine, and any noun used for a female is feminine. Why nouns that have no natural gender are not always neuter we cannot tell. Hence no absolute rule can be laid down for the guidance of modern students, though the presence of the Greek article with substantives shows already how the word in question was used. All the older Indo-germanic languages have three genders, but the Sanskrit has no gender for the personal pronouns, nor has the Greek except αὐτός when so used. Delbrueck thinks that originally all the masculine nouns of the α declension were feminine, and all the feminine of the ο declension were masculine.

(c) The New Testament usage does not vary greatly from the earlier custom. The classic ὁ πλοῦτος sometimes (Rom. 2:4). So also occasionally ἔλεος, ζῆλος. Ὁ δεσμός (Lu. 13:16) is τὰ δεσμά in the plural (Lu. 8:29) as well as οἱ δεσμοί (Phil. 1:13). In general it should be said that many proper names are treated as indeclinable when they could be inflected like Βηθφαγή (Matt. 21:1).

CHAPTER V.

THE DECLENSION OF ADJECTIVES.

1. *The origin of adjectives.*

(a) The line of demarkation between substantive and adjective is not easily drawn. Giles, for instance, in his admirable *Manual of Comparative Philology* has no separate treatment of adjectives, and treats them incidentally in connection with the discussion of substantives and suffixes. So also Whitney in his *Sanskrit Grammar* has no distinct treatment of adjectives, but says, "The accordance in inflection of substantive and adjective stems is so complete that the two cannot be separated in treatment from one another."

(b) Most of the Sanskrit adjectives have only one or two endings, though some have all three genders. The great bulk are *a* stems for masculine and neuter, while the feminine may have *ā* or *ī*, and this matter is "determined in great part only by actual usage, and not by grammatical rule."

(c) Thus it is clear that the adjective is a gradual variation from the substantive. The substantive is an essential appellative (*ὀνόματα ἐπίθετα*). But substantives were doubtless used in this descriptive sense before adjectives arose and are still so used, as, for instance, we say brother man. So in the New Testament *ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ* (Matt. 3:6), *προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει* (Heb. 12:22). This is, indeed, apposition, but it is descriptive apposition, and it is just at this point that the adjective emerges (Delbrueck), though, of course, at a very early period.

(d) Adjectives then specialize one use of substantives, though the substantive retains in some measure the descriptive appositional usage. But Greek has a much more developed system of adjectives than the Sanskrit and it has survived fairly well in the modern Greek, though a strong tendency exists in the vernacular to simplify adjectives to one declension.

2. *The declension of adjectives.*

(a) Some Greek adjectives, like most of the Sanskrit *a* stem adjectives, have only one inflection for all genders, though they are actually not used for the neuter. So πένης (2 Cor. 9:9), ἅρπαξ (Matt. 7:15) and συγγενίς (Lu. 1:36). It is here that we can best see the evolution of the adjective.

(b) Still other adjectives have only two sets of endings, the masculine and the feminine being the same. So εὐγενής (Lu. 19:12), ἵλεως (Matt. 16:22), μείζων (John 14:28).

(c) Sometimes also adjectives which can be inflected with three sets of endings are used with only two. So αἰώνιος (Heb. 5:9) is feminine.

(d) Once again some adjectives are no longer used with three terminations, as ἔρημος (Gal. 4:27). Both of these examples come ultimately from the Septuagint, and ὅσιος (1 Tim. 2:8) has two terminations as early as Plato (Simcox). See also μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία (Jas. 1:26).

(e) The majority of Greek adjectives have three endings, one for each gender. This is true of all the participles and the other verbal adjectives. All the distinctively feminine inflections belong to the first (*a* declension). But the masculine and neuter inflections fall into either the second (*o* declension) or the third declension (consonant and close vowel).

(f) Compound adjectives like ἄτεκνος (Lu. 20:28) or εὐγενής generally have only two endings. So with the Attic second declension (ἵλεως).

(g) The participles also make the feminine forms according to the first declension, but the masculine and neuter follow either the second or the third. The Greek participle endings are very much like those of the Sanskrit and Latin participles.

(h) The New Testament usage is in general in harmony with the older language. Χρυσᾶν (not Χρυσῆν) occurs in Rev. 1:13. Ἡμίσους, not ἡμίσεος, appears in Mark 6:23 (thus also in papyri, Deissmann), and βαθέως, not βαθέος, in Luke 24:1. Συγγενής has συγγενῆν according to some documents in Rom. 16:11 and συγγενεῦσι is the correct reading in Mark 6:4. This word also has a late feminine

in -ις (Luke 1:36). Πλήρης is probably indeclinable (as in papyri) in John 1:14 and is probably the true reading in Acts 6:5.

3. *The comparison of adjectives.*

(a) It is not always necessary to use the comparative and superlative forms in order to express the ideas of comparison. The other devices used will be discussed under the syntax of the adjective.

(b) In the Sanskrit the suffixes of primary derivation for comparative and superlative (*iyans*, *istha*) are much like -ιων, -ιστος of the Greek. In the modern Greek these suffixes are not used at all, and in the earlier Greek they are less common than -τερος, -τατος, which suffixes are like the Sanskrit suffixes of secondary derivation (tara, tama) and alone survive in modern Greek.

(c) Ἀκριβέστατος (Acts 26:5) and ἁγιώτατος (Jude 20) are the only superlatives in -τατος in the New Testament (Blass), and there are not a great number in -ιστος, though we have μέγιστος (2 Pet. 1:4), ἐλάχιστος (Luke 16:10), and a few others. The comparative in -τερος is common in the New Testament as τομώτερος (Heb. 4:12), nor is ων uncommon as in μείζων (Matt. 11:11). Cf. μικρότερος in same verse. Τάχιον (τάχειον) supplants θᾶσσον (John 20:4).

(d) A double comparative with both forms appears in μειζότερος (3 John 4), like our vernacular "lesser." So Paul makes a comparative on a superlative in ἐλαχιστότερος (Eph. 3:8) like our vulgar "leaster." Cf. μεγιστότατος in papyri.

(e) Comparatives made from adverbs we see like ἐξώτερος (Matt. 8:12) or from prepositions like πρότερος (Eph. 4:22).

(f) The superlative is little used in the New Testament. In the vernacular of the modern Greek the superlative form is hardly used at all, but rather the article and the comparative form. The beginning of this usage is apparent in the New Testament as in ὁ μείζων (Matt. 18:4) and μείζων (Matt. 18:1). When the superlative is used it is usually elative (like our very), not the true superlative.

(g) Other devices used are μᾶλλον, μάλιστα. But sometimes the context is relied on to suggest comparison. Compare Luke 15:7. In Mk. 7:36 we have a double comparative μᾶλλον περισσότερον.

Prepositions like παρά, ὑπέρ, etc., can be used also rather than ἤ after a comparative as Heb. 9:23; Luke 16:8. The ablative is common after the comparative as πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ (Matt. 12:45).

4. *Adjectival numerals.*

(a) WH read τέσσερα (Rev. 4:6), τεσσεράκοντα (Matt. 4:2), τεσσερακονταετής (Acts 7:23), but τέσσαρες (Acts 21:9), τέσσαρας (Jo. 11:17). The papyri (Moulton) do not, save in cases of ignorant scribes, use τέσσερες, but the form occurs in the later Byzantine Greek, though not in modern Greek.

(b) The Sanskrit, like the Greek, inflects the first four cardinal numbers in the various genders, though, of course, in only one number in each instance. The Greek words themselves are like the Sanskrit in root. With ἀνὰ εἷς, καθ' εἷς (Rev. 21:21; Mark 14:19) the form is not indeclinable, but the preposition (so in modern Greek also) is simply the original adverb with no prepositional force. In Sanskrit cardinal numerals from 5-19 are usually inflected, but without gender, though sometimes indeclinable. In Greek cardinal numbers from 5-10 are indeclinable.

(c) Πρῶτος as an ordinal is used in Mark 16:9. Elsewhere the cardinal εἷς is found as in Matt. 28:1. The ordinals are all adjectival like the cardinals from 200 up.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DECLENSION OF PRONOUNS.

1. *Pronominal roots.*

(a) Substantives are kin to verbs in root and adjectives are variations of the substantive. But pronouns belong to a separate stock and Bopp has rightly divided roots into verbal and pronominal. All other forms as adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, intensive particles, are really case forms of nouns or pronouns. Hence three sets of stems stand out with special prominence built on two root stocks. These stems are verbs, nouns, pronouns.

(b) Once more noun and pronoun are vitally connected with the verb. The noun is so employed in root formation and the pronoun is used to form the personal endings of the verb. Hence the actual verb form is made up from the two roots of the language, the verbal and the pronominal.

(c) Monro (Homeric Grammar, p. 57) further remarks that noun stems name or describe while pronouns only point out, the one is predicative, the other demonstrative. In a sense then all pronouns were originally demonstrative. In the Sanskrit the pronominal roots are demonstrative (Whitney) and differ fundamentally from the roots of nouns.

2. *Brief sketch of pronominal forms.*

Some of the forms are the most primitive known in the Indogermanic languages. In the Sanskrit personal pronouns of the first and second persons have no distinction of gender and are made up of fragments of various roots.

(a) In Greek ἐγώ was originally ἐγών like the Sanskrit *aham*. This ἐγώ form appears in Latin ego, Gothic ik, German ich, French je, Anglo-Saxon ic, English I. So σύ is in Doric τύ like the Latin tu, etc. The Sanskrit is tuam. Compare aham. The oblique forms

in the singular come from another stem which is practically the same in all the above languages, *mam*, ἐμέ, *me*, etc. (σέ is from τέ, original *tue*) for the accusative; ἐμέσιο, ἐμέο, ἐμοῦ (μοῦ) and σείο, σέο, σοῦ for the genitive-ablative; ἐμοί, σοί have the locative ending used for locative, dative, instrumental; in the plural ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς come from the Lesbian ἀμμές, ὑμμές; ἡμῶν, ὑμῶν are a new formative (Giles), ἡμῖν, ὑμῖν are locative forms.

(b) The New Testament does not use the third personal form of οὗ, οἷ, ἕ, σφεῖς, etc. Instead the forms of αὐτός occur in all genders and both numbers. In the modern Greek this form in some of the oblique cases is shortened to the enclitic forms τοῦ, τῶν, etc. But on the whole personal pronouns have retained the case-forms better than any other parts of speech.

(c) The possessive pronouns ἐμός, σός are made from the personal pronominal stems, and ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος, are really comparative forms. The reflexive is merely the personal pronoun plus the intensive αὐτός.

(d) The reflexive forms of the first and second persons are not used in the plural except ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (1 Cor. 7:35) for ἡμῶν αὐτῶν is emphatic rather than reflexive in 2 Thess. 1:4 (Simcox). The uncontracted form σεαυτοῦ alone is used. Westcott and Hort print αὑτοῦ, etc., about twenty times (against most recent editors) rather than always αὐτοῦ or ἑαυτοῦ. So we have αὐτὸν in John 2:24 and ἑαυτὸν in Luke 15:17. The variations in the manuscripts make it hard to decide this point.

(e) The demonstrative ὅδε is formed from the old demonstrative ὁ and δέ and is declined like ὁ. Οὗτος is apparently a doubling of ὁ and τό (stem of ὁ) with a connecting vowel υ and is a strengthened demonstrative. The form οὑτοσί does not appear in the New Testament. Ἐκεῖνος (Homer, κεῖνος) is from the locative form (adverb) ἐ-κε-ῖ (compare Latin hi-c, English hi-ther). Το-ι-οῦτος is still another compound of οὗτος and τοῖ-ος. Τοιοῦτο, not τοιοῦτον, is neuter in the New Testament. Τοῖος (τοιόσδε) is the demonstrative to which corresponds the relative οἷος and ὁποῖος and the interrogative ποῖος. In modern Greek ὁ ὁποῖος is the common relative. A similar correspondence is shown between, τόσος (τοσόσδε) and

τοσοῦτος, ὅσος, and πόσος. Αὐτός has not been explained nor ὁ δεῖνα.

(f) The relative is the demonstrative ὅς developed like English that. In Homer ὥς is often demonstrative "thus." Ὅστις is merely the addition of the indefinite τὶς to ὅς both of which may be declined or only τὶς. But in the New Testament this form is never used outside of the nominative except in case of ἕως ὅτου (John 9:18) and ὅτι as accusative neuter (Luke 10:35). In the modern Greek ὅς as a relative pretty nearly disappears out of the common speech and besides ὁ ὁποῖος we see ὅπου and ποῦ used, as ὁ ἀνὴρ ὅπου εἶδα. Compare the vulgar English use of "whar" as "the man whar did that is a rascal."

(g) The interrogative form τίς is really the same root as the Latin quis, Sanskrit kas, Gothic kwas, German wer, Anglo-Saxon hwa, English who. In English and Latin the relative is formed from the same root, but in Greek the relative has a demonstrative origin like English relative that. Both Latin and Greek make an indefinite form from this root as ali-quis, τὶς.

(h) The reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλων is, of course, a reduplication of ἄλλος as in English we say "one another." Ἴδιος is kin to Latin *suum* (ϝε) and so means what belongs to one's self. The modern Greek has developed a number of special pronominal forms like κανείς besides those retained from the old Greek.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONJUGATION OF THE VERB.

1. *Relation of verb forms and noun forms.*

(a) The verb forms actually in use are made from primitive roots like λείπω(λιπ) or from denominative stems like τιμάω (τιμα). Substantives and adjectives are constantly also made from verbs as λοιπός (λείπω). "The relation between substantive and verb is at all times very close" (Giles, Handbook of Comparative Philology, p. 424).

(b) The various verb forms use suffixes as substantives do. "These suffixes, however, are exactly parallel to the suffixes in the substantive, and in many instances can be identified with them" (Giles, *ibid*). In fact two of the so-called verb forms remain as much noun as verb, the infinitive and participle. The infinitive is always a verbal substantive, and the participle a verbal adjective.

(c) The Sanskrit was especially rich in verbal substantives that illustrate the close relation between verb and substantive. These purely verbal substantives had no tense and no voice, but were fixed case-forms as the genitive-ablative in *as*, the locative in *i*, the dative in *ai* or *e*, the accusative in *am* or *m*. This accusative verbal form gradually displaced the others in Sanskrit as did the Latin supine in *tum*. But in Greek the dative form gains the day as in Homer δοῦναι is like Sanskrit *devane* and ἴδμεναι is like Sanskrit *vidmane*. Forms like λύειν are probably in the locative. The Greek infinitive thus is a verbal substantive in the dative case (or locative) though gradually in usage the dative case idea is no longer retained and this form is used in any case in the singular save the vocative. Voice and tense appear in the Greek infinitive.

(d) The Sanskrit likewise uses verbal adjectives made by suf-

fixes quite similar to those in the Greek (*ant*, *mana*, *ta*, etc.) and they have voice and tense, but the participle has its fullest development in the Greek language. The infinitive and the participle have no personal endings and never have a subject. They are both always in a case relation to some verb, substantive, or preposition. The participle has inflection in both numbers and all genders, though the infinitive is itself indeclinable. In the modern Greek the final *ν* of the infinitive is dropped as *λύει*.

(e) In the New Testament there are no peculiar forms for those verbal nouns, though *πεῖν* (also *πῖν*), not *πιεῖν*, appears in John 4:7. Westcott contends for infinitive in *-οῖν* with verbs in *-οω* (not *οῦν*) except in Luke 9:31. But this position J. H. Moulton objects to from evidence of the papyri.

2. *The building of the verb.*

(a) The verb (verbum, word) is the word *par excellence*. It is the main word in the sentence and as such receives more changes and expresses thereby more varieties of meaning than the substantive.

(b) Perhaps originally the roots were not distinctively either verb or substantive, but in the Sanskrit the substantive had an earlier and fuller development than did the verb. The system of case endings used in noun inflection is best seen in the Sanskrit, but the verb conjugation appears in its perfection in the Greek. The tense system is fairly well developed in the Sanskrit, but the modes and the voices not so much so. In the Latin the verb swings far away from the line of progress seen in the Greek, so that Greek and Latin are more unlike in verb conjugation than in noun inflection, though both grow out of tendencies observable in the Sanskrit. In the early Sanskrit the aorist is very common in various modes, but it almost disappears in the later.

(c) The Greek verb is a complicated, though beautiful, piece of word mechanism, and needs to be studied analytically. Mere memorizing of the conjugations is not enough, though necessary. The first thing to do is to find the verb stem or theme which may be a root like *λιπ* or a derivative stem like *τιμα*. Around this theme or verb stem the verb forms are built with architectural skill. The

ground floor, so to speak, is the aorist tense (the old aorist, the so-called second aorist) which is often identical with the present as ἔ-φη-ν. By a series of suffixes the other tenses, the modes, the voices, the persons, the number are all expressed.

(d) The suffixes include all the additions to the theme. The dictionaries give the verb in the present tense and the impression is thus created that the present tense is the stock around which the verb grows. Thus on the theme λιπ you make the aorist in the various modes and voices, the present in the various modes and voices (and the imperfect), the perfect in the various modes and voices, and so the future. The tense suffix is reasonably stable and the mode sign also. The personal endings have to express voice, person, and number and appear in two forms (primary and secondary) which may have been originally one.

(e) In the earlier Greek there is a strong tendency towards dropping the personal endings. All verbs were originally μι verbs. In Homer many verbs have μι that do not in the Attic, while in the New Testament and the papyri many of the Attic verbs in μι are dropping the μι as διδῶ (Rev. 3:9), ἱστάνω (Rom. 3:30). In the modern Greek the μι forms belong only to the high style. The common people use only ω verbs. The early Greeks had thus two systems of conjugation, the μι inflection where the personal endings were put directly to the root or root plus mode and tense suffixes, and the ω inflection where the personal endings are connected with the tense and mode stem by variable vowels ο/ε. But the constant history of language was in the direction of the disuse of the μι inflections and the unification of all verbs under the ω conjugation as with ἀφίουσιν (Rev. 11:9). As with nouns, so with verbs the dual is no longer in use. The papyri (Deissmann) have even δύνομαι like B in the Gospels and Acts.

3. *The tenses.*

(a) The aorist. The New Testament preserves the original second aorist of the μι form (non-thematic) which is really the original verb-form, as ἔστην, ἔγνων. The second aorist form (thematic) with the variable vowel ο/ε appears also as ἔλιπον. The reduplicated aorist also survives as ἤγαγον (Luke 22:54). There is

even a reduplicated first aorist, ἐκέκραξα (Acts 24:21). The first aorist forms with $^{\alpha}/_{\epsilon}$ (with or without σ) are frequent as ἔλεξα, ἔκρινα. To obtain the root, $^{\alpha}/_{\epsilon}$, $^{o}/_{\epsilon}$, or $\sigma^{\alpha}/_{\epsilon}$ must be dropped. One of the peculiarities of the New Testament usage is the increased use of $^{\alpha}/_{\epsilon}$ even with second aorist stems. This usage existed already in the case of εἶπα, ἤνεγκα, ἔπεσα along with εἶπον, ἤνεγκον, ἔπεσον. In the New Testament, as in the papyri, it is extended greatly to such forms as ἦλθαν, εἶδαν, ἀνεῦραν, ἀνεῖλαν. In fact, the modern Greek uses only some dozen of the old second aorists. Everywhere else the later first aorist has the field. The ending οσαν, common in Septuagint, existing in papyri, and frequent in modern Greek vernacular, is strongly attested for παρελάβοσαν (Mg. of W H) in 2 Thess. 3:6. Ἡμάρτησα (Rom. 5:14) as well as ἥμαρτον (1 Cor. 7:28) is found. The growth is towards aorists with σα. We have ἐδώκαμεν in 1 Thess. 4:2. Again forms like ἀφῆκες (Rev. 2:4) occur as in the papyri and the modern Greek. Ἐγενήθην is found also (Acts 4:4). In Acts 28:26 εἰπόν, not εἰπέ, is the imperative form. In Mark 12:1 ἐξέδετο, not ἐξέδοτο, has lost the root vowel and the thematic vowel ε has taken its place. The New Testament preserves the three aorists in κα (ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἧκα).

(b) The present-tense system. In no part of the Greek verb (and Sanskrit) do we have such a complicated system as in the present system. There are (Brugmann) thirty-two classes of Indogermanic verbs in the tense system, thirty of which the Greek possesses. However, they can all be grouped under seven simple divisions which are practically the same as the Sanskrit systems. If the present is built on the aorist (or identical with it as is often true like φη-μί), the obvious and easy way to make the present would be to add the primary personal endings to the aorist or present stems, and this is seen in such forms as φη-μί. Here ἔ-φη-ν is either aorist or imperfect, for there would be no distinction in forms. The imperfect is merely a variation of the present stem with secondary endings. Some of these presents are reduplicated like δί-δω-μι, for reduplication is not confined to the perfect. Rather it seems to begin with some aorists, continue with some presents, and then be taken up by the perfect tense. What is called the

variable (thematic) vowel class is but a step removed from the root class, for ἔ-λεγ-ο-ν is exactly like ἔ-λιπ-ο-ν (Giles) in form. Hence we may argue that λέγ-ο-μι (λέγω) is made from the aorist stem by the addition of the thematic vowel. If so, ἔλεγον was originally aorist as well as later imperfect like ἔ-φη-ν. This fact throws some light on the frequent use of ἔλεγον in the New Testament, for instance. The ν class (nasal class) comprises both of the previous classes, those that merely add one of the ν combinations of the root (non-thematic) as σβέ-ννυ-μι, and those that use the variable vowel also (thematic) as ἁμαρτ-άν-ω, λαμβάνω. The aorist and the imperfect, of course, differ as ἔ-λαβ-ον, ἐ-λάμβαν-ον. The strong vowel class is just like the variable vowel class save that the root vowel has been strengthened. Here a distinction, as in the ν class, exists between the aorist and the imperfect, as ἔ-φυγ-ον, ἔ-φευγ-ον. The τ class differs from the variable vowel class only in the insertion of τ before the variable vowel and the consequent euphonic changes ἐ-βάφ-ην, βάπ-τω. The ι class likewise inserts ι before the variable vowel with various euphonic results such as στέλ-λω, κηρύσ-σω. Not all the verbs in the σκ°/ε or ισκ°/ε class are inceptive, and some have reduplication as γι-γνώ-σκω. The New Testament writes γινώσκω, γίνομαι. The uncontracted form δύνασαι (Matt. 5:36) and the contracted form δύῃ (Mark 9:22) both exist. So ῃ, and not ει, is the usual form of contracts in εω for second person middle singular indicative. New presents like στήκω (Phil. 1:27) are built from the perfect stem. Ἤφιεν (Mark 1:34) is treated like an uncompounded ω verb. In Rev. 2:20 note ἀφεῖς from ἀφέω. In ἠρώτουν (Matt. 15:23) we have Ionic contraction of αω verbs like εω. Note reading of A νικοῦντι (Rev. 2:7). The imperfect, like the aorist, has forms in α. So εἶχαν (Mark 8:7). In εἶχοσαν (John 15:22, 24) and ἐδολιοῦσαν (Rom. 3:13, from the Septuagint) the imperfect follows the aorist in the use of οσαν like the papyri and the modern Greek. Winer is in error, however, in citing ἐδίδοσαν (John 19:3) as an example, for δο is here the root and σαν the usual secondary ending with μι verbs in the third person plural. This example does not appear in Winer-Schmiedel, sec. 13, 14. Ἐτίθουν (Acts 3:2) and ἐδίδουν (Acts 4:33) sometimes

displace the μι forms, as do ἀφίουσιν (Rev. 11:9), συνίουσιν (Matt. 13:13).

(c) The future system. The future tense is a later development and the tense has had a varied history. The Sanskrit had a periphrastic future made by a future active participle usually with an auxiliary. This method of making the future by an auxiliary and participle or infinitive has persisted till now. In the Germanic tongues the auxiliary and the infinitive is the only way of forming this tense. English has no future by the use of suffix. In the modern Greek the commonest way of forming the future is by means of θέλω and the infinitive (like English). Jebb thinks that Herodotus shows that the vernacular early began this usage. Here the origin of the idiom is seen in the purpose expressed by the auxiliary verb. But in the New Testament we must insist on the full force of θέλω as in John 7:17. Perhaps the original method was to have neither special form nor auxiliary, but to leave it to the imagination to tell when to project a verb into the future. Thus we still stay: "I go home next week." So Jesus said ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι (John 14:3). Some verbs never formed a future tense at all as εἶμι, though ἐλεύσομαι is made from ἔρχομαι. Εἶμι as future is not in the New Testament. Another device used to express time is μέλλω with the infinitive (aorist or present and once the future in the New Testament, as in earlier Greek) as in Matt. 11:14; Acts 3:3; 11:28. However, the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and other languages, have developed a distinct future tense form. The Sanskrit did it by the use of *sya* or *isya*, but this suffix, which means "go" as the Coptic suffix NA does, was rarely used (Whitney) partly because the subjunctive mode was practically a future in sense. In the Greek the future form in σ is much more common, though in Homer little distinction exists between the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative. The two forms may have a common origin (Giles), though this is not certain, for the future may be a variation from the present. This latter is the opinion of Delbrueck. The modern Greek has no future form at all and, when not using θέλω and infinitive, has θά and the subjunctive (cf. Homer). Forms like πίομαι (Luke 17:8), φάγομαι (*ibid.*) give color to the

aoristic origin of the future form. It may be that some verbs make the future from the aorist and some from the present. In the New Testament we have ἐκχεῶ, however, as in Acts 2:17. Ἐλπιοῦσιν (Matt. 12:21) and similar verbs drop the σ, like the Attic future, but βαπτίσω retains it (Matt. 3:11). Καλέσω, τελέσω retain the σ, while both ἀπολέσω (Matt. 21:41) and ἀπολῶ (1 Cor. 1:19) occur. The form (Doric) πεσοῦμαι (made from σεº/ε) is in the New Testament, but φεύξομαι. In Rev. 22:19 we have ἀφελῶ (so Septuagint) from ἀφαιρέω. The usual future of liquid verbs (εº/ε) like κρινῶ is common. So also ἀποθανοῦμαι. The Doric future seems like a combination of σ and ε (liquid verbs), or is it that σεº/ε is an original ending? This latter is entirely possible and the fact that the old Doric and Homer both have σεº/ε (cf. Sanskrit *syo*) lends color to the idea that the Indo-germanic had such a suffix. Cf. Kuehner-Blass, Laut-und Formenlehre, II, S. 105 f. I may add that Dr. W. O. Carver, of this Seminary, strongly inclines to this view. Hirt (Handbuch, etc., S. 403 f.), however, considers σεº/ε to be a union of σ and the liquid ε. The future appears in the New Testament only in the indicative mode and in the verbal nouns (infinitives and participles).

(d) The perfect system. This tense presents some special difficulties both as to formation and signification. We are concerned only with the formation, though it may be remarked that in the Sanskrit, as the aorist disappears, the perfect increases in use with apparent loss of precise distinctions. Both Greek and Sanskrit preserve reduplication, probably originating from the iterative and reduplicated present like γιγνώσκω. The perfect then is in form a variation from the present. However, we are utterly at sea as to the origin of κα which is usually added to the perfect active stem before the personal ending. The κ may be due to some reduplicated κ stems in the present, which set the style. Some color is lent to this idea by the presence of some older perfect forms without the κ as οἶδα, γέγονα, λέλοιπα, and the aspirated forms like γέγραφα. In fact a form without κ or α appears in some verbs like ἑ-στά-ναι (Acts 12:14). Besides ἥκω, though present in form, has the meaning of the perfect. Note ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω (Jo. 8:42). All

this seems to show that the common κα for the active was a gradual development. This κα was used also with a few aorists (ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἧκα). Compare modern Greek ἐλύθηκα for ἐλύθην. In the Latin a similar phenomenon occurs in the ending *vi* as in *ama-vi*, which has not been explained. The Latin has some reduplicated perfects like *dedi* and aoristic forms in *s* like *scripsi*. This form with double origin does double service in the Latin (both aorist and perfect). The modern Greek has wholly dropped the perfect form save in the passive participle. Instead ἔχω with the aorist infinitive (ει, not αι) is used as ἔχω λύσει much like the English. In the Attic we have sometimes ἔχω and the aorist participle. The past perfect in modern Greek is expressed by εἶχον λύσει. The Sanskrit has merely a trace of the past perfect. It was never very common in the Greek, though it was always at hand when needed. In the modern Greek, as in the old, the common tenses are the aorist, the present, and the imperfect. The perfect middle adds the personal endings directly to the reduplicated stem like ἕστα-μεν in the active. In the New Testament οἶδα is conjugated regularly in singular and plural of the indicative. Future perfect is εἰδήσω. In Acts 26:4 we have ἴσασιν. Outside of the indicative the form is εἰδῶ, ἴστε, εἰδέναι, εἰδώς. The opt. εἰδείην is not in the N. T. It is not only in Rev. (19:3) that forms like εἴρηκαν appear; they are in the rest of the New Testament (John 17:7, τετήρηκαν) and in the papyri. Ανσι, originally αντι, by analogy of aorist is αν. Κεκοπίακες Rev. 2:3 is like the aorist ἀφῆκες (Rev. 3:4) and such forms occur in the papyri among the ignorant scribes (Moulton). Ἀφέωνται (Luke 5:20) is a Doric form for ἀφεῖνται, though similar forms occur in Ionic and Arcadian. The past perfect like the imperfect, is confined to the indicative, and like it also usually has an augment besides the secondary personal endings. However, we have only κειν forms in the active. The Sanskrit had no future perfect nor has the modern Greek. In the ancient Greek are only two such active forms, ἑστήξω and τεθνήξω. The rest are in the middle voice. In the New Testament we have only εἰδήσω and that is from the Septuagint (Heb. 8:11). In Luke 19:40 some manuscripts read κεκράξουσιν. In Heb. 2:13 we have the periphrastic form ἔσομαι πεποιθώς. Such forms occur

for the present perfect and the past perfect also. This analytic use of the verb forms is more common in all the tenses in the New Testament idiom (like κοινή and Hebrew too), especially in Luke's writings, and finally in the modern Greek wholly destroys the perfect verb forms.

(e) Reduplication. This peculiarity is not confined to the perfect tense, though it is characteristic of the tense system and holds through all the modes and voices, whereas κα does not belong to all the verbs of the active and occurs no where else. Reduplication is found with the aorist, the present, the perfect as in Sanskrit. However, in the modern Greek reduplication has vanished save in the perfect passive participle. As has already been said its origin is found in the iterative presents where the verb idea was repeated by the repetition of the initial consonant or the modification of the initial vowel (if the verb begins with a vowel). The idea of the perfect tense grows out of the idea of repetition. The New Testament follows ancient usage in the formation of the reduplicated stem as γέγραπται (Acts 15:15), ἔγνωκαν (John 17:7), μέμνησθε (1 Cor. 11:2), εἴληφεν (Rev. 5:7), ἠλπίκατε (John 5:45), ἀκήκοα (1 John 1:1), ἑώρακας (John 8:57), ἑόρακα (1 Co. 9:1). Ἀκήκοα is an example of Attic reduplication.

(f) Augment. The Sanskrit augment is *a*. It has been suggested that this is the instrumental case of a demonstrative pronoun and means "there." It was a sign of past time and was used only with the past tenses of the indicative (aorist, imperfect, past perfect), but it was not always so used especially in the earlier language (Whitney). Augment, in fact, is found only in Sanskrit, Zend, Armenian, and Greek (Giles). In Greek it is found only in the past tenses of the indicative, but Homer is very irregular in his use of augment, half of his past tenses not having it (Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 44). The iterative verbs in Homer do not take the augment at all. It would seem then that the augment as the sign of past time was at first only used when it was necessary to make plain that the form was a past tense. In Homer we find both the syllabic augment (ε) and the temporal augment, the lengthening of the initial vowel, though the syllabic augment is

sometimes used with a vowel also. Augment is preserved in the modern Greek. In the New Testament it is not found with some words like προορώμην (Acts 2:25), ἀφέθησαν (Rom. 4:7), οἰκοδομήθη (John 2:20), ἀπώσατο (Rom. 11.1). Μέλλω, δύναμαι, βούλομαι, as in ancient Greek, sometimes have the temporal augment in addition to (not instead of as Winer) the syllabic as ἠδυνήθην (Mark 9:28). With compound words the usage varies. The augment may be after the preposition as παρῴκησεν (Heb. 11:9) or before as ἐπροφήτευσαν (Matt. 11:13). Some words have double augment as ἀπεκατεστάθη (Matt. 12:13) or even treble augment as ἠνεῴχθησαν (Matt. 9:30). Ἐργάζομαι has ἠργάσατο (Matt. 25:16) regularly. The past perfect does not always use the augment as τεθεμελίωτο (Matt. 7:25), yet see ἐβέβλητο (Luke 16:20).

4. *The modes.*

(a) *The indicative.* There is no mode suffix for the indicative. It is, of course, the normal mode for all the Indo-germanic languages, and is always used by them unless there is special reason for using one of the other modes. It is the only mode which uses all the tenses in Sanskrit and Greek. In the Sanskrit the future occurs only in the indicative, and the perfect appears only in the indicative and the participle save a few examples in the early Sanskrit (the Veda) of the other modes. The imperfect and the past perfect, of course, belong to the indicative only. Hence in Sanskrit it is only the aorist and the present that use modes other than the indicative. This is interesting as showing the gradual growth of the modes. In modern English we have nearly come round again to the position of the Sanskrit in our almost exclusive use of the indicative. The subjunctive, optative, and imperative are variations from the indicative and the old injunctive mode.

(b) *The subjunctive.* In the early Sanskrit the subjunctive is very common with the aorist and the present and has a special mode sign *a*. But the later Sanskrit nearly loses this mode as we have in English nearly ceased to use it. The first person survives as a practical imperative. In Greek the earliest form of the subjunctive with non-thematic stems is not different from the indicative with thematic stems and uses ᵒ/ε, not ω/η, just like the indica-

tive thematic stems. So ἴομεν is subjunctive in Homer, while ἴμεν is indicative. In the early Ionic the non-thematic stems do in some cases use ω/η, but not always. It would seem therefore that the subjunctive mode sign was first the variable vowel ο/ε already in use. This sign was gradually lengthened into ω/η. Even in the fifth century B. C. the Ionic has aorist subjunctives like ποιήσει. Hence, "the distinction between indicative and subjunctive cannot always be easily drawn" (Giles). It is also probable that the Attic futures ἔδομαι, πίομαι, and the New Testament φάγομαι (Jas. 5:3) were originally aorist subjunctives. The mode suffix was first added to the stem as in the μι forms (δό-η=δῷ) and in the aorist passive forms (λυ-θέ-ω=λυθῶ). In Mark 8:37 δοῖ is subjunctive (as in papyri), όη=οῖ as often. But with thematic stems the variable vowel ο/ε was merely changed to ω/η and the σ aorist makes the subjunctive σω/ση. In δύνωμαι, δύνηται we either have irregular accent and contraction (so ἱστῆται, αη=η instead of α) or the mode sign ω/η displaces α of the stem. So the optative δύναιτο has irregular accent (compare ἱσταῖτο). Homer frequently uses μι with the subjunctive of verbs, ἐθέλωμι, ἴδωμι. The subjunctive used only primary personal endings in both Sanskrit and Greek. In Greek the subjunctive has increased in the frequency with which it is used, and in the modern Greek has displaced both the optative and the infinitive (save with auxiliary verbs). The Greek used a perfect subjunctive also, though it was never very common in the nature of the case. In the New Testament besides εἰδῶ (1 Cor. 2:12) we only have examples of the *periphrastic perfect subjunctive* like ᾖ πεποιηκώς (Jas. 5:15), ᾖ κεκλημένος (Luke 14:8). The later Byzantine Greek, like the Latin, developed a future subjunctive which is not, however, preserved in the modern Greek where the ancient future forms are lost. Occasionally manuscripts of the New Testament give such forms in some verbs as κερδηθήσωνται (1 Pet. 3:1), and in Luke 13:28 Westcott and Hort print ὄψησθε in the text and ὄψεσθε in the margin. This may, however, be a late first aorist form. Cf. mg. ἄρξησθε (Lu. 13:26) with text ἄρξεσθε.

(c) *The optative.* The Greek is the only language that preserved both subjunctive and optative in its flourishing period. In the

Sanskrit the optative displaced the subjunctive save in a few special uses, while in the Latin the subjunctive was extended in its scope to partial future time as well as present, like the indicative, and the optative was not used. As a matter of fact both subj. and imperative are future in idea. The Gothic has only one such mode whether subjunctive or optative is not clear. In Homer the subjunctive and optative struggle together, the optative gains a firm place, especially in the literary style, and then loses it gradually till in the modern Greek it does not exist. In the New Testament it occurs only sixty-seven times, Luke using it twenty-eight and Paul thirty-two times, John, Matthew and James do not have it at all, and Mark, Hebrews and Jude only once each, Peter using it four times. It seems never to have been common in the vernacular and is correspondingly scarce in the papyri. The Sanskrit had two mode signs for the optative either *ya* or *i*. So the Greek has two mode signs for the optative either ι or ιη. The latter is used with non-thematic tense stems like δο-ίη-ν, the former with thematic stems like λίπ-ο-ι-μι, λύ-σα-ι-μι. The subjunctive and the optative mode suffixes are an addition to the tense stem and hence seem to show that these modes grew after the origin of tenses. The personal endings of the optative are chiefly secondary, though μι is primary. The mode doubtless was meant to be secondary and the subjunctive primary, but in actual usage this is not always true. In the Sanskrit the optative is used in all sorts of ways as the subjunctive is in Latin save that it has no future, but its use to express a wish is really future and μι in the Greek suggests connection with primary ideas as well as secondary. The subjunctive in Latin, and often also in Greek, is used after secondary tenses. The Greek, moreover, developed a future optative which was used only in indirect discourse after secondary tenses. This tense does not appear in the New Testament. The aorist and present optative are the tenses commonly used. The ancient Greek had a perfect optative, but in the New Testament we have no perfect. Indeed in all late Greek the perfect subj., opt., and imperative are very rare. Cf. J. E. Harry in *The Classical Review* for 1905-1906. The Attic ειαι (ειε) instead of αι in the first aorist is found in the Textus Re-

ceptus as ποιήσειαν (Luke 6:11), but in W H and Nestle ποιήσαιεν. But in Acts 17:27 the critical text has ψηλαφήσειαν.

(d) *The imperative.* The imperative is in a way a makeshift and seems a development from the indicative and injunctive. Some of the forms are just like the indicative as λέγετε and this only the context can decide. Cf. Jo. 5:39 and 14:1. The imperative, like the indicative, has no mode suffix. In fact the future indicative in Greek, as in Hebrew and English, is often used where the imperative could have been employed as οὐ φονεύσεις (Matt. 5:21). And for the first person both in Sanskrit and Greek the subjunctive is used for the hortatory idea. There is no first person imperative form, though in English we say "Charge we the foe." Moreover, in Latin the third person can be used for exhortations also, but in Sanskrit and Greek the aorist subjunctive was early used with *ma*, μή in prohibitions, probably before there was an aorist imperative. In Sanskrit the imperative is little used outside of the present tense. With this late mode the present comes before the aorist in time and the aorist imperative is nearly confined to positive commands. However in the New Testament we have for the third person μὴ καταβάτω (Mk. 13:15) and similar aorist negative imperatives. Other imperative forms use merely the stem like the original vocative (Giles) as ἴστη. Other imperatives again use the variable vowel like λέγε, λαβέ, λίπε, probably interjectional forms if ε is part of the root (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 171). Brugmann considers that the accent of λαβέ, εἰπέ, ἐλθέ, εὑρέ, ἰδέ, is that of all imperatives originally when at the beginning of a sentence. But in the N. T. we have ἴδε, λάβε. Some imperative forms are possible substantives as βάπτισον, βάπτισαι (Acts 22:16). See use of στοιχεῖν (Phil. 3:16) and the common χαίρειν (James 1:1) like papyri. Again other imperative forms use personal endings like στῆ-θι, with which compare the Sanskrit *dhi*, or like τω (Sanskrit *tu*, originally *tod* the ablative of the demonstrative pronoun). The plural in ντων is like the Sanskrit *ntu* with ν added. But the Doric makes the plural ντω. But this Attic form is displaced in the later κοινή (New Testament and papyri) by τω-σαν (compare σαν in plural of secondary tense). Thus also σθων became σθωσαν. It remains

to speak of θές, ἕς, δός, σχές which seem kin to the unaugmented aorist indicative (injunctive like λύθητε). In the modern Greek the first and third persons are expressed by ἄς (ἄφες) and the subjunctive much like the English "let" and the infinitive. In the New Testament we already see ἄφες ἐκβάλω (Luke 6:42). In the use of φάγοι (Mark 11:14) the optative clearly approaches the imperative. There is, of course, no future imperative, for all imperatives are future in idea. The perfect is sometimes used in Greek as πεφίμωσο (Mark 4:39) as in the earlier Sanskrit. But it is not used in the modern Greek. In Lu. 12:35 we find ἔστωσαν περιεζωσμέναι. Forms like ἀνάβα (Rev. 4:1) merely use the stem. Ἤτω (ἔστω) appears in the New Testament and the papyri (possibly Doric) as in 1 Cor. 16:22. Sometimes the imperative form is used with either number and is practically interjectional as ἄγε (Jas. 4:13) as in the older Greek. Compare ἀγέτω in Greek and *agito* in Latin. The periphrastic imperative occurs also as in ἴσθι εὐνοῶν (Matt. 5:25). Cf. γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες (2 Cor. 6:14). Note two persons in Mk. 14:42.

5. *The voices.*

(a) *The active.* It is probable, though by no means certain, that the active is the original voice. The personal endings of the active are evidently kin to the pronouns. Compare μι and μεν (μες) with the oblique forms of ἐγώ, σι and τε with σύ, τι and ντι (νσι) with the demonstrative τός (ὅς). In a wonderful way these pronominal suffixes express person, number, and voice. The secondary endings differ from the primary in being shorter and in having a few special forms like σαν and in the fact that ν replaces μ (μι). There is in Greek a certain tendency towards abbreviation of these suffixes. So μι continually drops off, σι in full form appears only in ἐσ-σί and τι only in ἐσ-τί. We have the same situation in the English verbal suffixes, retaining them only in the second and third person singular.

(b) *The middle.* The middle is the only other voice that appears in the Sanskrit where every active ending has a corresponding middle. However, not all verbs have both voices, some having only the active, some only the middle, and some tenses using only

one voice. In Homer the middle is more common (Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 7) than in any other period of the Greek language. In the modern Greek it is well nigh displaced by the passive, and the distinctively passive forms (aorist) are used, though the vernacular uses aorist middle imperative λύσου rather than λύθητι. In the New Testament the middle is disappearing before the passive. In Latin the passive has wholly supplanted the middle though some verbs retain a middle sense. It is supposed by some (Donaldson, *New Cratylus*,) that the middle endings are formed by doubling the suffix for the active. So then μαι is from μαμι, the second μ having dropped out. This is in entire accord with the idea of the middle voice, though it is wholly conjectural. Still it is just as possible (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 152) that the active τίθημι may be a weakening of μαι to μι in τίθεμαι with a corresponding lengthening of ε to η (cf. τίθεμεν in plural). Some middle forms occur, however, in the later Greek that are not common in the older Greek like ἤμην (Matt. 25:35). In the modern Greek εἰμί is always middle save in the form εἶνε (εἶναι), etc., which takes the place of ἐστί (ἐντί). The contraction in the second person singular of the indicative of εσαι into ει is rare in the later Greek. It is usually η. So even with ὄψῃ (Matt. 27:4), though uncontracted forms like δύνασαι (Luke 16:25) occur. So also φάγεσαι, πίεσαι (Luke 17:8). But βούλει is found in Luke 22:42.

(c) *The passive.* In the Sanskrit, as in the Coptic, there is no passive voice. However the Sanskrit shows the beginning of a passive formation. In the present tense verbs of the *ya* class form a virtual passive by accenting it as *yá*. Such verbs use the middle endings and are conjugated in the same way except the accent. But in the Greek more progress has been made. Two tenses in the Greek have distinctive passive conjugation, the aorist and the future. But here again the aorist passive uses the active endings and the future passive the middle endings. The Greek passive then has no endings of its own. In most tenses it merely borrows the entire middle inflection, while in the two tenses above it draws on the active and middle both. The so-called second aorist passive like ἐ-στάλ-η-ν is really the second aorist active (root aorist)

like ἔ-βη-ν, ἔ-φη-ν. And the special suffix θε (θη) which the passive uses for the first aorist stem is sometimes used as an active form (Giles, *Comparative Philology*, p. 411). The future passive is merely the addition of σ°/ε to θη. But even here some future middle forms like ἀδικήσομαι are used in a passive sense just as in the other middle forms. Clearly then the passive is later in origin than both active and middle and is built out of both of them though it never did have a complete set of distinctive endings. In the Latin the passive early displaced the middle, but in the Greek the process was much more slow. In the New Testament the passive has greatly increased in use. New passive forms appear like ἐγενήθην (Matt. 6:10) not common in the earlier Greek. So ἐφύην in Luke 8:6, ἠγγέλην (Luke 8:20), διετάγην (Gal. 3:19). The future passive is also common as κοιμηθησόμεθα (1 Cor. 15:51), and the second future passive as ἀλλαγησόμεθα (*ibid*). For all three voices of γινώσκω see 1 Cor. 13:12.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRINCIPAL PARTS OF SOME IMPORTANT VERBS.

The perfectly regular verbs like λύω, φιλέω, φωτίζω, etc., call for no comment. The rare verbs are not given with fulness. All that is here attempted is a summary of the most important verbs in the New Testament that haye anything specially noteworthy about any of the tenses. It will be a handy list for the student. Only the forms that occur in the N. T. are given. Few things are more essential in Greek than a ready knowledge of the verb.

Ἀγγέλλω (comp. ἀν-, ἀπ-, δι-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, προ-επ-, κατ-, προ-κατ-, παρ-), ἤγγελλον, ἀγγελῶ, ἤγγειλα, -ήγγελμαι, -ηγγέλην.

Ἄγω (comp. ἀν-, ἐπ-αν-, ἀπ-, συν-απ-, δι-, εἰσ-, παρ-εισ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, κατ-, μετ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ἐπι-συν-, ὑπ-), ἦγον, ἄξω, ἤγαγον and ἦξα, ἤχθην, ἀχθήσομαι.

Αἰνέω (comp. ἐπ-, παρ-), -ήνουν, -αινέσω. -ήνεσα.

Αἱρέω (comp. ἀν-, ἀφ-, δι-, ἐξ-, καθ-, περι-, προ-), -ελῶ and αἱρήσομαι, -εἷλον and εἷλα, ᾑρέθην.

Αἴρω (comp. ἀπ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, μετ-, συν-, ὑπερ-), ἀρῶ, ἦρα, ἦρκα, ἦρμαι, ἤρθην, ἀρθήσομαι. Imper. ἆρον and inf. ἆραι.

Ἀκούω (comp. δι-, εἰσ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, προ-, ὑπ-), ἤκουον, ἀκούσω and ἀκούσομαι, ἤκουσα, ἀκήκοα, ἠκούσθην.

Ἀλλάσσω (comp. ἀπ-, δι-, κατ-, ἀπο-κατ-, μετ-, συν-), ἀλλάξω, ἤλλαξα, -ήλλαγμαι, -ηλλάγην, ἀλλαγήσομαι.

Ἁμαρτάνω (προ-), ἁμαρτήσω, ἥμαρτον and ἡμάρτησα, ἡμάρτηκα.

Ἀνα-βαίνω (only in comp., ἀνα-, προσ-ανα-, συν-ανα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-, συμ-), -έβαινον, -βήσομαι, -έβην, -βέβηκα. Short forms ἀνάβα, ἀνάβατε in imper.

Ἀν-αλίσκω (only in comp., ἀν-, προσ-αν-, κατ-αν-). Other forms from ἀναλόω, ἀναλώσω, ἠνάλωσα and ἀνάλωσα, ἀνηλώθην.

Ἀν-οίγω (only in comp., ἀν-, δι-αν-), ἀνοίξω, ἀνέῳξα, ἤνοιξα, and ἠνέῳξα, ἀνέῳγα, ἀνεῳγμένος and ἠνεῳγμένος, ἠνοίγην, ἀνοιγήσομαι, ἀνεῴχθην, ἠνοίχθην, and ἠνεῴχθην, ἀνοιχθήσομαι.

Ἀπαντάω (only in comp., ἀπ-, συν), -αντήσω, -ήντησα.

Ἀποκτείνω (only in comp.), ἀποκτενῶ, ἀπέκτεινα, ἀπεκτάνθην. Pres. inf. also ἀποκτέννεσθαι.

Ἀπόλλυμι and ἀπολλύω (only in comp., ἀπ-, συν-απ-), ἀπολέσω and ἀπολῶ, ἀπώλεσα, ἀπολωλώς; midd. ἀπόλλυμαι, ἀπωλλύμην, ἀπολοῦμαι, ἀπωλόμην.

Ἅπτω (ἀν-, καθ-, περι-), ἥπτόμην, ἧψα, ἡψάμην, ἥφθην.

Ἀπ-ωθέω (only comp., ἀπ-, ἐξ-), -ὦσα, -ωσάμην.

Ἀρέσκω, ἤρεσκον, ἀρέσω, ἤρεσα.

Ἀρκέω (ἐπ-), ἤρκεσα, ἀρκεσθήσομαι.

Ἀρνέομαι (ἀπ-), ἀρνήσομαι, -ηρνησάμην, ἤρνημαι, -αρνηθήσομαι.

Ἁρπαζω (δι-, συν-), ἁρπάσω, ἥρπασα, ἡρπάγην, ἡρπάσθην, ἁρπαγήσομαι.

Ἄρχω (ἐν-, προ-εν-, προ-ϋπ-), ἦρχον, ἄρξομαι, ἠρξάμην.

Αὐξάνω (συν-, ὑπερ-), ηὔξανον, αὐξήσω, ηὔξησα, ηὐξήθην.

Ἀφ-ικνέομαι (only comp., ἀφ-, δι-, ἐφ-), ἀφικόμην.

Βαίνω, see ἀναβαίνω.

Βάλλω (ἀμφι-, ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, παρ-εμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, συμ-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο-), βαλῶ, ἔβαλον and once ἔβαλα, -εβαλόμην, βέβληκα, -βεβλήκειν, βέβλημαι, ἐβεβλήμην, ἐβλήθην, βληθήσομαι.

Βαπτίζω, ἐβάπτιζον, ἐβαπτιζόμην, βαπτίσω, ἐβάπτισα, (-σάμην), βεβάπτισμαι, ἐβαπτίσθην, βαπτισθήσομαι.

Βιόω, ἐβίωσα.

Βλάπτω, βλάψω, ἔβλαψα.

Βλέπω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, περι-, προ-), ἔβλεπον, βλέψω, ἔβλεψα.

Βούλομαι, ἐβουλόμην, ἐβουλήθην. Note βούλει (Lu. 22:42).

Γαμέω, ἐγάμουν, ἔγημα and ἐγάμησα, γεγάμηκα, ἐγαμήθην. Γαμίσκω only in present.

Γελάω (κατα-), -εγέλων, γελάσω.

Γίνομαι (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συμ-παρα-, προ-), γενήσομαι, ἐγενόμην, and ἐγενήθην, γέγονα, ἐγεγόνειν, γεγένημαι. Never γίγνομαι as in Attic.

Γινώσκω (ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-), ἐγίνωσκον, γνώσομαι, ἔγνων, ἔγνωκα, ἐγνώκειν, ἔγνωσμαι, ἐγνώσθην, γνωσθήσομαι. Subj. γνῷ and γνοῖ, imper. γνῶθι, inf. γνῶναι, part. γνούς. Never γιγνώσκω.

Γράφω (ἀπο-, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-), ἔγραφον, γράψω, ἔγραψα, γέγραφα, γέγραμμαι, -εγεγράμμην, ἐγράφην.

Δείκνυμι and δεικνύω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, ὑπο-), δείξω, ἔδειξα, ἐδείχθην.

Δέομαι (προσ-), ἐδεόμην, ἐδεήθην. In Lu. 8:38 W H read ἐδεῖτο. Impersonal δεῖ and ἔδει.

Δέρω, ἔδειρα, δαρήσομαι.

Δέχομαι (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, εἰσ-, ἐκ-, ἀπ-εκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, παρα-, προσ-, ὑπο-), ἐδεχόμην, ἐδεξάμην, δέδεγμαι, -εδέχθην.

Δέω (κατα-, περι-, συν-, ὑπο-), δήσω, ἔδησα, -εδησάμην, δέδεκα, δέδεμαι, -εδεδέμην, ἐδέθην.

Διακονέω (only thus), διηκόνουν, διακονήσω, διηκόνησα, διηκονήθην.

Διδάσκω, ἐδίδασκον, διδάξω, ἐδίδαξα, ἐδιδάχθην.

Δίδωμι and occasionally διδόω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἀντ-απο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-), ἐδίδουν, δώσω, ἔδωκα and sometimes ἔδωσα, δέδωκα, δεδώκειν and ἐδεδώκειν, δέδομαι, ἐδόθην, δοθήσομαι. 2 aorist ind. plural ἐδώκαμεν, subj. δῶ, δοῖ, and δώῃ, opt. δῴη in Eph. 1:17 (W H text) instead of δοίη. Imperf. ind. midd. occasionally ἐδίδετο and 2 aor. ind. midd. sometimes ἔδετο.

Διψάω, διψήσω, ἐδίψησα. In Jo. 7:37 διψᾷ.

Διώκω (ἐκ-, κατα-), διώξω, ἐδίωξα, δεδίωγμαι, διωχθήσομαι.

Δοκέω (εὐ-, συν-ευ-), ἐδόκουν, ἔδοξα, εὐδόκησα, ηὐδόκησα.

Δύναμαι, ἐδυνάμην and ἠδυνάμην, δυνήσομαι, ἠδυνήθην and ἠδυνάμην. Both δύνασαι and δύῃ.

Δύω and δύνω (ἐκ-, ἀπ-εκ-, in midd., ἐκ, ἐπ-εν-, παρ-εισ-, ἐπι-), ἔδυν and ἔδυσα (-εδυσάμην), -εδύην.

Ἑάω (προσ-), εἴων, ἐάσω, εἴασα.

Ἐγγίζω (προσ-), ἤγγιζον, ἐγγίσω, ἤγγισα, ἤγγικα.

Ἐγείρω (δι-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, συν-), ἐγερῶ, ἤγειρα, ἐγήγερμαι, ἠγέρθην, ἐγερθήσομαι.

Εἶδον, see ὁράω.

Εἶδω is obsolete in present, but perfect is common. Οἶδα (in both numbers, ἴσασιν once in Acts 26:4 and ἴστε), subj. εἰδῶ, opt. absent, imper. ἴστε (Jas. 1:19), inf. εἰδέναι, part. εἰδώς.

Ἔθω is obsolete, but εἴωθα and εἰώθειν occur.

Εἴκω (ὑπο-), εἶξα.

Ἔοικα is from obsolete present εἴκω.

Εἰμί (ἄπ-, ἔν-, πάρ-, συμ-πάρ-, σύν-), ἦν and ἤμην, ἔσομαι. Ἔστω and ἤτω.

Εἶμι (only comp., ἄπ-, εἴσ-, ἔξ-, ἔπ-, σύν-), -ἰέναι. Present always in future sense.

Ἔπω obsolete present. Εἶπον (ἀντ-, ἀπ-, προ-) and εἶπα, ἐρῶ, εἴρηκα, εἰρήκειν, εἴρημαι, ἐρρέθην and ἐρρήθην (Attic). Both εἰρήκασιν and εἴρηκαν, εἰπόν and εἰπέ, εἰπών and εἴπας, εἶπες and εἶπας, but only εἰπάτω, εἴπατε, εἰπάτωσαν.

Ἐκ-τείνω (only comp., ἐκ-, ἐπ-εκ-, ὑπερ-εκ-), -έτεινον, -τενῶ, -έτεινα.

Ἐκ-τρέπω (only comp., ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-), -ετρεπόμην, -έτρεψα, -ετράπην, -τραπήσομαι.

Ἐκ-χέω and ἐκ-χύν(ν)ω (only comp., ἐκ-, ἐπι-, συγ-, ὑπερ-εκ-), -έχυννον, -χεῶ, -έχεα, -κέχυμαι, -εχύθην, χυθήσομαι. Uncontracted forms ἐκχέετε and ἐξέχεεν.

Ἐλαύνω (ἀπ-, συν-), ἠλαυνόμην, -ήλασα, ἐλήλακα.

Ἐλέγχω (ἐξ-, δια-κατ-), -ηλεγχόμην, ἐλέγξω, ἤλεγξα (-άμην).

Ἐλπίζω (ἀπ-, προ-), ἤλπιζον, ἐλπιῶ, ἤλπισα, ἤλπικα.

Ἐν-τέλλομαι (only comp. and midd.), -τελοῦμαι, -ετειλάμην, -τέταλμαι.

Ἐργάζομαι (κατ-, περι-, προσ-), εἰργαζόμην (some MSS) and ἠργαζόμην (so W H), ἠργασάμην, εἴργασμαι (passive).

Ἔρχομαι (ἀν-, ἐπ-αν-, ἀπ-, δι-, εἰσ-, ἐπ-εισ-, παρ-εισ-, συν-εισ-, ἐξ-, δι-εξ-, ἐπ-, κατ-, παρ-, ἀντ-παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-), ἠρχόμην, ἐλεύσομαι, ἦλθον and ἦλθα, ἐλήλυθα.

Ἐρωτάω (δι-, ἐπ-), ἠρώτων and ἠρώτουν, ἐρωτήσω, ἠρώτησα.

Ἐσθίω and ἔσθω (κατ-, συν-), ἤσθιον, φάγομαι, ἔφαγον.

Εὐαγγελίζω (προ-), εὐηγγελιζόμην, εὐηγγέλισα (-σάμην), εὐηγγέλισμαι, εὐηγγελίσθην.

Εὐδοκέω. See δοκέω.

Εὐκαιρέω, εὐκαίρουν (also ηὐκ-), εὐκαίρησα.

Εὐλογέω goes regularly with εὐ (not ηὐ) in most MSS.

Εὑρίσκω (ἀν-), εὕρισκον and ηὑρ-, εὑρήσω, εὗρον (εὕραμεν, etc.), and εὕρησα (some MSS.), εὕρηκα, εὑρέθην, εὑρεθήσομαι.

Εὔχομαι (προσ-), ηὐχόμην, εὐξάμην.

Ἔχω (ἀν-, προσ-αν-, ἀντ-, ἀπ-, ἐν-, ἐπ-, κατ-, μετ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο-), εἶχον (εἴχαμεν, etc.), ἕξω, ἔσχον, ἔσχηκα. Εἶχοσαν as well as εἶχαν and εἶχον.

Ζάω (ἀνα-, συ-), ἔζων, ζήσω (-ήσομαι), ἔζησα. Ind. ζῇς, inf. ζῆν.

Ζώννυμι and ζωννύω (ἀνα-, δια-, περι-, ὑπο-), ἐζώννυον, ζώσω, ἐζωσάμην, -έζωσμαι.

Ἥκω (ἀν-), ἧκον, ἥξω, ἧξα, ἧκα (some MSS. in Mk. 8:3). Some MSS. ἥκασιν instead of ἥκουσιν.

Θάπτω (συν-), ἔθαψα, ἐτάφην.

Θαυμάζω (ἐκ-), ἐθαύμαζον, θαυμάσω, ἐθαύμασα, ἐθαυμάσθην, θαυμασθήσομαι.

Θέλω (not ἐθέλω), ἤθελον, θελήσω, ἠθέλησα.

Θιγγάνω, ἔθιγον.

Θλίβω (ἀπο-, συν-), ἔθλιβον, τέθλιμμαι.

Θνήσκω (ἀπο-, συν-απο-), -θανοῦμαι, -έθανον, τέθνηκα. Both τεθνάναι and τεθνηκέναι, but only τεθνηκώς.

Ἱλάσκομαι, ἱλάσθητι (Lu. 18:13).

Ἵστημι, ἱστάνω, ἱστάω, (ἀν-, ἐπ-αν-, ἐξ-αν-, ἀφ-, δι-, ἐν-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-(ἐπίσταμαι), ἐφ-, κατ-εφ-, συν-εφ-, καθ-, ἀντι-καθ-, ἀπο-καθ-, μεθ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, συν-), στήσω (-ήσομαι), ἔστην, ἔστησα, ἕστηκα (intr.) and ἔστακα (tr.), εἰ(ι)στήκειν, ἐστάθην, σταθήσομαι. Both ἑστώς and ἑστηκώς, but always ἑστάναι.

Καθαίρω (δια-, ἐκ-), -εκάθαρα, κεκάθαρμαι.

Καθαρίζω (δια-), καθαριῶ, ἐκαθάρισα, κεκαθάρισμαι, ἐκαθαρίσθην, ἐκαθερίσθη (Matt. 8:3).

Κάθημαι (συγ-), καθέζομαι (παρα-), καθίζω (ἀνα-, ἐπι-, παρα-, περι-, συγ-); ἐκαθήμην, καθήσομαι. Κάθου (κάθησο); ἐκαθεζόμην, καθίσω (ἰσομαι), ἐκάθισα, ἐκαθισάμην, κεκάθικα.

Καίω (ἐκ-, κατα-), καύσω, -έκαυσα, κέκαυμαι, -εκάην, -εκαύθην, -καήσομαι, καυθήσομαι. In 1 Cor. 13:3 some MSS. have καυθήσωμαι.

Καλέω (ἀντι-, ἐν-, εἰσ- (-μαι), ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, συν-παρα-, προ-, προσ-, συγ-), ἐκάλουν, καλέσω, ἐκάλεσα, κέκληκα, κέκλημαι, ἐκλήθην, κληθήσομαι.

Κάμνω, ἔκαμον, κέκμηκα.

Κεράννυμι (συγ-) and κεραννύω, ἐκέρασα, κεκέρασμαι.

Κερδαίνω, κερδήσω, ἐκέρδησα (κερδάνω some MSS. in 1 Cor. 9:21), κερδηθήσομαι.

Κλαίω, ἔκλαιον, κλαύσω, ἔκλαυσα.

Κλάω (ἐκ-, κατα-), ἔκλασα, ἐκλάσθην.

Κλείω (ἀπο-, ἐκ-, κατα-, συγ-), κλείσω, ἔκλεισα, κέκλεισμαι, ἐκλείσθην.

Κλίνω (ἀνα-, ἐκ-, κατα-, προσ-), κλινῶ, ἔκλινα, κέκλικα, ἐκλίθην.

Κομίζω (ἐκ-, συγ-), κομίσομαι and κομοῦμαι, ἐκομισάμην.

Κόπτω (ἀνα-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, κατα-, προ-, προσ-), ἔκοπτον, κόψομαι, -ἔκοψα, ἐκοψάμην.

Κράζω (ἀνα-), ἔκραζον, κράξω, ἔκραξα and ἐκέκραξα, κέκραγα. Some MSS. κεκράξομαι.

Κρέμαμαι (ἐκ-), κρεμαννύω, κρεμάζω, and κρεμάω, ἐξ-εκρέμετο (Lu. 19:48), ἐκρέμασα, ἐκρεμάσθην.

Κρίνω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἀντ-απο-, δια-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συν-, ὑπο-, συν-υπο-), ἐκρινόμην, κρινῶ, ἔκρινα, κέκρικα, κεκρίκειν, κέκριμαι, ἐκρίθην, κριθήσομαι.

Κρύπτω (ἀπο-, ἐν-, περι-), ἔκρυψα, κέκρυμμαι, ἐκρύβην.

Κυλίω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, προσ-), κυλίσω, -εκύλισα, -κεκύλισμαι.

Λαγχάνω, ἔλαχον.

Λαμβάνω (ἀνα-, ἀντι-, συν-αντι-, ἀπο-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, συν-παρα-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, συν-περι-, ὑπο), ἐλάμβανον, λήμψομαι, ἔλαβον (ἐλάβατε 1 Jo. 2:27), ἐλαβόμην. Λάβε, not λαβέ. Εἴληφες in Rev. 11:17.

Λανθάνω (ἐκ-, ἐπι-), ἔλαθον, ἐλαθόμην, -λέλησμαι.

Λέγω (ἀντι-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, προ-) to say, only pres. and imperf. in N. T. Some MSS. ἔλεγαν in Jo. 11:56. Cf. εἶπον.

Λέγω to collect (only comp. δια-, ἐκ-, συλ-), -ελεγόμην, -λέξω, -ἔλεξα (-άμην), -λέλεγμαι, -ελέχθην.

Λείπω (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, ἐν-κατα-, περι-, ὑπο-), ἔλειπον, -λείψω, ἔλιπον, -λέλειμμαι, - ελείφθην.

Μανθάνω (κατα-), ἔμαθον, μεμάθηκα.

Μέλω, only μέλει impersonal. Ἐπι-μέλομαι and ἐπι-μελέομαι, -μελήσομαι, -εμελήθην. Μετα-μέλομαι, -εμελόμην, -εμελήθην, -μελεθήσομαι.

Μέλλω, ἔμελλον and ἤμελλον, μελλήσω.

Μένω (ἀνα-, δια-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, συν-παρα-, περι-, προσ-, ὑπο-), μενῶ, ἔμεινα, -μεμένηκα, μεμενήκειν.

Μίγνυμι and μίσγω (συν-ανα-), ἔμιξα, μέμιγμαι.

Μιμνήσκω (ἀνα-, ἐπ-ανα-, ὑπο-), μνήσω, μέμνημαι, ἐμνήσθην, μνησθήσομαι.

Οἰκοδομέω (ἀν-, ἐπ-, συν-), ᾠκοδόμουν, οἰκοδομήσω, ᾠκοδόμησα (also οἰκοδ-), ᾠκοδόμημαι, ᾠκοδομήμην, ᾠκοδομήθην, οἰκοδομηθήσομαι.

Ὁράω (ἀφ-, καθ-, προ-), ἑώρων (some MSS. in Jo. 6:2), -ωράμην (-ορώμην), ὄψομαι, ὠψάμην (Lu. 13:28), ἑώρακα and ἑόρακα, ἑωράκειν, ὤφθην, ὀφθήσομαι. Εἶδον (εἶδα, εἴδαμεν) is from obsolete stem ιδ- (Latin *video*). Subj. ἴδω, imper. ἴδε (not ἰδέ), inf. ἰδεῖν, part. ἰδών.

Παίζω (ἐν-), -έπαιζον, παίξω, -έπαιξα, -επαίχθην, -παιχθήσομαι.

Πάσχω (προ-, συμ-), ἔπαθον, πέπονθα.

Παύω is regular save ἀναπαήσομαι.

Πείθω (ἀνα-), ἔπειθον, πείσω, ἔπεισα, πέποιθα, ἐπεποίθειν, πέπεισμαι, ἐπείσθην, πεισθήσομαι.

Πεινάω, πεινάσω, ἐπείνασα. Inf. πεινᾶν.

Περι-τέμνω (only comp.), -έτεμον, -τέτμημαι, -ετμήθην.

Πήγνυμι (προσ-), ἔπηξα.

Πιάζω and πιέζω (ὑπο-), ἐπίασα, πεπίεσμαι, ἐπιάσθην.

Πίμπλημι (ἐμ-) and ἐμ-πιμπλάω, ἔπλησα, ἐπλήσθην.

Πίμπρημι and πιμπράω (ἐμ-), -έπρησα.

Πίνω (κατα-, συν-), ἔπινον, πίομαι, ἔπιον, πέπωκα. Both πεῖν (MSS. even πῖν) and πιεῖν, but only πίε. Cf. πίεσαι.

Πιπράσκω, ἐπίπρασκον, πέπρακα, πέπραμαι, ἐπράθην.

Πίπτω (ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προσ-, συμ-), ἔπιπτον, πεσοῦμαι, ἔπεσον and ἔπεσα, πέπτωκα. Cf. πέπτωκες (Rev. 2:5) and πέπτωκαν (Rev. 18:3).

Πλέω (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, κατα-, παρα-, ὑπο-), -έπλεον, -έπλευσα.

Πλήσσω (ἐκ-, ἐπι-), -επλησσόμην, -έπληξα, ἐπλήγην (-επλάγην).

Πνέω (ἐκ-, ἐν-, ὑπο-), ἔπνευσα.

Πνίγω (ἀπο-, ἐπι-, συμ-), ἔπνιγον, ἔπνιξα, -επνίγην.

Πράσσω, πράξω, ἔπραξα, πέπραχα, πέπραγμαι.

Πυνθάνομαι, ἐπυνθανόμην, ἐπυθόμην.

Ῥαντίζω, ἐράντισα (some MSS. ἐρράντ-) ῥεράντισμαι (some MSS. ἐρρ).

Ῥέω (παρα-), ῥεύσω, -ερρύην.

Ῥίπτω (ἀπο-, ἐπι-) and ῥιπτέω, ἔριψα (and ἔρρ-), ἔρριμμαι (and ἔρ-).

Σβέννυμι and σβεννύω, σβέννυμαι, σβέσω, ἔσβεσα, σβεσθήσομαι.

Σημαίνω, ἐσήμαινον, ἐσήμανα.

Σπάω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, περι-), -εσπώμην, σπάσω, ἐσπασάμην, -εσπάσθην.

Σπείρω (δια-, ἐπι-), ἔσπειρα, ἔσπαρμαι, ἐσπάρην.

Στέλλω (ἀπο-, ἐξ-απο-, συν-απο-, δια-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συν- or συ-, ὑπο-), -εστελλόμην, στελῶ, -έστειλα (-άμην), -έσταλκα, -έσταλμαι, -εστάλην. Cf. ἀπέσταλκαν in Acts 16:36.

Στήκω (cf. mod. Gk. στέκω) pres. from ἕστηκα (cf. γρηγορέω from ἐγρήγορα), imperf. ἕστηκον in Jo. 8:44 and Rev. 12:4 acc. to W H.

Στηρίζω (ἐπι-), στηρίξω and στηρίσω in some MSS. (cf. στηριῶ in LXX), ἐστήριξα and ἐστήρισα, ἐστήριγμαι, ἐστηρίχθην.

Στρέφω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, συν- or συ-, ὑπο-), -στρέψω, ἔστρεψα, -έστραμμαι, ἐστράφην.

Στρωννύω and στρώννυμι (κατα-, ὑπο-), ἐστρώννυον, ἔστρωσα, ἔστρωμαι, ἐστρώθην.

Συ-ζεύγνυμι (only comp.), συνέζευξα.

Συν-τέμνω (only comp.), συντετμημένος in some MSS. (Rom. 9:28).

Σφάζω (κατα-), σφάξω, ἔσφαξα, ἔσφαγμαι, ἐσφάγην.

Σώζω (δια-, ἐκ-), ἐσωζόμην, σώσω, ἔσωσα, σέσωκα, σέσωσμαι, ἐσώθην, σωθήσομαι.

Τάσσω (ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-δια-, ἐπι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-), ἔταξα (-άμην), τέταχα, τέταγμαι, -ετάγην, -ετάχθην.

Τελέω (ἀπο-, διά-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, συν-), τελέσω, ἐτέλεσα, τετέλεκα, τετέλεσμαι, ἐτελέσθην, τελεσθήσομαι.

Τίκτω, τέξομαι, ἔτεκον, ἐτέχθην.

Τρέφω (ἀνα-, ἐκ-, ἐν-), ἔθρεψα, -εθρεψάμην, τέθραμμαι, -ετράφην.

Τρέχω (εἰσ-, κατα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ἐπι-συν-, ὑπο-), ἔτρεχον, ἔδραμον.

Τυγχάνω (ἐν-, ὑπερ-εν-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συν-), ἔτυχον, τέτυχα and τέτευχα (or even τετύχηκα in MSS. in Heb. 8:6).

Τύπτω has only present stem in N. T. See πατάσσω and πλήγνυμι.

Φαίνω (ἀνα-), φανοῦμαι, -έφανα, ἐφάνην, φανήσομαι.

Φέρω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, εἰσ-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-), ἔφερον (-όμην), οἴσω, -ήνεγκον and ἤνεγκα, ἠνέχθην.

Φεύγω (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, κατα-), φεύξομαι, -πέφευγα, ἔφυγον.

Φθάνω (προ-), ἔφθασα, ἔφθακα.

Φθείρω (δια-, κατα-), φθερῶ, ἔφθειρα, -έφθαρμαι, ἐφθάρην, φθαρήσομαι.

Φοβέομαι (ἐκ-), ἐφοβούμην, ἐφοβήθην, φοβηθήσομαι.

Φράσσω, ἔφραξα, ἐφράγην, φραγήσομαι.

Φύω (ἐκ-, συμ-), ἐφύην.

Χαίρω (συν-), ἔχαιρον, ἐχάρην, χαρήσομαι (some MSS. χαρῶ in Rev. 11:10).

Χαρίζομαι, χαρίσομαι, ἐχαρισάμην, κεχάρισμαι, ἐχαρίσθην, χαρισθήσομαι.

Χράομαι (κατα-), ἐχρώμην, ἐχρησάμην, κέχρημαι.

Χρή (impersonal) only once, Jas. 3:10.

Ψύχω, ψυγήσομαι.

Ὀνέομαι, ὠνησάμην, not ἐπριάμην.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FORMATION OF WORDS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The history of Greek words.* The usage of the New Testament is in harmony with the history of the language. Each word has its own history as truly as each individual man. Take σκάνδαλον, for instance. It occurs first in the Septuagint, a noose, a snare, as in Ps. 69:23. It was the trapstick, the trap, then any impediment, then a stumbling block, then any person who is an occasion of stumbling as in Joshua 23:13. So Peter became a stumbling block to Jesus (σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ, Matt. 16:23). Christ crucified became a σκανδάληθρον, trap-stick. The root σκανδ is seen in the Sanskrit *ska'ndā'mi*, to dart, to leap, and in the Latin *scando*, *descendo*. This is a very simple illustration and is chosen for that reason. One does not fully know a Greek word till he knows its history. The resultant meaning of a word in any given instance will be determined by the etymology, the development, and the immediate context. These three things are to be carefully noted before a final conclusion can be safely reached. Roots are either primitive or denominative. Wherever possible, find the root of a Greek word. This is a fascinating subject that can here be merely sketched. See Curtius, *Greek Etymology* (1886).

2. *The kinship of Greek words with each other.* There are smaller families of Greek words which are all kin to the common stock and to each other. Δείκνυμι is a good illustration in point. The root is δικ and so appears in δίκ-η. The Sanskrit *dic-ā'-mi* means to show, to point out, and *dicā'* is judgment whether of men or gods. The root is strengthened in the Greek verb, and δείκνυμι is to show, to point out. Δίκη is the way pointed out, right or justice. Δίκην is the adverbial accusative and means "after the way of" or like. Δεῖξις is a showing, δεῖγμα something pointed out, while

δίκαιος is a man who seeks to go the right way, a righteous man. Δικαιόω is to make righteous and then usually to show or declare righteous, while δικαίωσις is the act of declaring righteous. Δικαίωμα is what has been declared righteous whether deed or law, while δικαιοσύνη is the quality of being righteous whether actual righteousness or attributed righteousness. Δικαίως is a righteous method or manner, while δικαιωτής or δικαστής is one who decides righteously. Δικαστήριον, finally, is the place where things or persons are shown to be righteous. Each of these many words from one common root occurs in the New Testament save one (δικαιωτής). The difference in meaning lies here not so much in the changes due to the lapse of time and new connections, for this word has shown itself to be very persistent in its root idea. The change in idea is here due chiefly to the difference in the suffixes. One cannot thus rightly comprehend the significance of New Testament words till he understands the import of the Greek suffixes and prefixes. The ideas of action, agent, result, instrument, quality, place, person, etc., are differentiated in substantives (and adjectives to some extent) in this manner. Λύτρον, for instance, in Matt. 20:28 is λύ-ω plus -τρον which means the instrument. The offered life of Jesus is the means of loosing us from the penalty of our sins. So ἀπο-λύ-τρω-σις (Rom. 3:24) is the act of loosing us from the penalty of sin by means of the death of Christ and consequent reconciliation. We are restored to the favor of God. Here again a great theme can be only outlined. See the Greek grammars for the significance of the prefixes and suffixes.

3. *The contrasts in Greek words.* Different words are used to express varying shades of the same general idea. With δίκαιος, for instance, it is profitable to compare καλός, ἀγαθός, ἅγιος, ὅσιος, καθαρός, where goodness is looked upon not so much as right, but as beautiful, admirable, consecrated, undefiled, purified. Compare νέος and καινός, the one young and not yet old, the other recent and not ancient. So τέρας is a wonder or portent, σημεῖον a sign or proof, δύναμις a power or mighty work. Clear perception of such distinctions is essential to correct exegesis of the New Testament. We see Jesus himself insisting on the use of ἀγαθός for the idea of abso-

lute goodness when he said: Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός (Mark 10:18). Both ἀγαθός and δίκαιος occur together in Luke 23:50. In Luke 8:15 καρδία ἀγαθὴ καὶ καλή approaches Socrates' frequent use of these two adjectives together. Compare our "the beautiful and the good." See Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament* (1890); Heine, *Synonomik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (1898).

4. *Compound words.* The Greek is not equal to the German in the facility with which it forms compound words, but it is a good second. A few striking examples can here be given and special attention called to the subject. No part of the compound word is meaningless. Ἀλλοτρι-επίσκοπος (1 Peter 4:15) is a good example, for we have σκοπος, επι, αλλοτριος, each with its own history, and each contributing to the resultant idea of one who takes the supervision of other men's matters which in no wise concern him. Another good illustration is αὐτο-κατά-κριτος (Titus 3:11). See also προσωπο-λήμπτης (Acts 10:34), διπλοῦς (1 Tim. 5:17), ὀφθαλμοδουλία (Eph. 6:6), λογομαχία (1 Tim. 6:4) which does not occur in the older Greek, μονόφθαλμος (Mark 9:47). The New Testament uses compound words in harmony with the principles of the ancient Greek, though sometimes the meaning is not perfectly clear as in the case of ἐθελοθρησκία (Col. 2:23). Paul is fond of piling up words together to express his emotion as ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ (Eph. 3:20).

5. *Light from other tongues.* A number of roots belong to the common Indo-germanic stock. Others are found in one or another of the kindred languages. Take δείκνυμι again. Besides the Sanskrit *dic-á-mi* the Latin has *dic-o*, *in-dic-o*, *judex*. The Gothic has the root in the form *teiho* a messenger, the German has *zeigen* to show, the English uses indicate, indict, contradict, judge, etc. Take σκέπτομαι. The Sanskrit root is *spac* look, *spacas* a spy. The Zend has *cpac* look at, spy. In Latin we have *specio*, *con-spicio*, *spec-ulum*, *spec-to*. In the Greek root metathesis has taken place and σπεκ has become σκεπ. Hence σκέπτομαι is to spy out, σκοπή is a watching, σκοπιά is a watchtower, σκοπός is a spy and then aim or goal, σκώψ is owl. In Phil. 3:14 Paul says κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω. See Curtius, *Greek Etymology* (1886).

6. *New Testament developments.* There are no "Biblical" suffixes or terminations. The new words in the New Testament are formed in harmony with the Greek idiom Συγκοινωνός (Rom. 11:17), for instance, is after the analogy of σύντροφος. Ἡρῳδιανός (Matt. 22:16) and χριστιανός (Acts 11:26) are Latin formations like *Romanus*, *Africanus*. The proper names in the New Testament are like those in current vernacular use at the time often in abbreviated form as Ἀπολλώς and also Ἀπολλώνιος. Ἁγιασμός is similar in formation to πειρασμός. There is an increasing number of verbs in -όω and -ίζω like βαπτίζω, ῥαντίζω. Compound words are always to be noticed carefully and each element in the composition given due significance, as, for example, ἀντιπαρῆλθεν in Luke 10:31. The priest went along on the opposite side of the road. A number of words once held to be Biblical or peculiar to the Septuagint are now known to be common in the vernacular κοινή as shown by the papyri as, for instance, γογγύζω, πρεσβύτερος in the official sense. On the whole there is little of a special nature in the formation of New Testament words, but much can be learned from the use of comparative philological principles. The most astonishing thing about the New Testament words is not the number of new formations, but the scarcity of such words. There are, we now know, only about "50 new formations among the round 5,000 words of the New Testament" (Deissmann, *Philology of the Greek Bible*), just one per cent. And this "fifty" may become "ten" before we are done with the papyri. This volume of Deissmann's is the best single handbook of the new knowledge from the papyri and the Septuagint.

PART III.

SYNTAX.

CHAPTER X.

THE SENTENCE.

The Sentence itself calls for some comment. In a larger treatise much more space would be needed. But here a few words must suffice.

1. The sentence is the expression of an idea and is complex. The subject and predicate are essential to the complete expression of a sentence, which may be very brief. Indeed one word may have both as *ἀπέχει* (Mk. 14:41). Indeed the sentence does not absolutely require the expression of either subject or predicate. Both may be suggested or implied as in the case of *οὐχί* (Lu. 1:60), *ναί, κύριε* (Jo. 11:27).

2. The subject may be itself the center of a group of words (substantives, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, etc.). Cf. Rom. 7:10 *ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν.*

3. The predicate may also be the center of a group of words as *τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν* (Jo. 4:23). Subject and predicate are thus the two foci of the sentence.

4. The predicate is either a verb or a substantive, adjective, etc., with a copula (*εἰμί, καλοῦμαι*, etc.) expressed or implied. Thus *ὁ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος* (Matt. 13:38). Cf. Jo. 4:11; Rom. 1:7.

5. Apposition is found both with the subject as *ἀνὴρ προφήτης* (Lu. 24:19) or the predicate as *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον* (Rom. 3:25). As a rule the verb agrees with the subject in person. The first person prevails when two or more are used as *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν* (Jo. 10:30).

6. The subject and the predicate agree in number except that construction according to sense often prevails over mere grammatical number as *ὁ ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν* (Matt. 21:8). The neuter plural

may take a singular (Lu. 4:41) or a plural verb (*ibid.*). Paul sometimes uses the literary plural as in 2 Cor. 10:13.

7. Substantives and adjectives as a rule agree in gender. Some adjectives have no distinctive feminine form as ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον (Jo. 6:47). Often gender is according to sense as ἔθνη ἐσκοτισμένοι (Eph. 4:17 f.). Words vary in gender also. The whole question of grammatical gender is unsatisfactory to us moderns.

8. Adjectives, participles, and substantives in apposition agree usually in case. But anacoluthon is common in all Greek in this matter, especially colloquial Greek or impassioned argument. Note καθαρίζων in Mk. 7:19; πρεσβυτέροις, ἐκλεξαμένους, γράψαντες (Acts 15:22 f.). The book of Revelation is full of such anacolutha with participles or words in apposition. Sometimes as in ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν (Rev. 1:4) it is intentional anacoluthon.

9. Sentences are either simple or compound. Compound sentences are either paratactic or hypotactic (co-ordinate or subordinate). Co-ordinate sentences may have connectives as is usual (καί, δέ, etc.) or not (asyndeton as 1 Cor. 13:7). Even subordinate sentences may have asyndeton of the conjunction as θέλεις εἴπωμεν (Lu. 9:54).

10. Syntax deals with the relations of words with each other, of clauses with each other, with sentences, and with paragraphs. We take up words first.

CHAPTER XI.

SUBSTANTIVE, ADJECTIVE, ADVERB.

1. The parts of speech are connected with each other more or less. It is simply mechanical to think of anything else. Adverbs bulk largely in furnishing various parts of speech in the development of language, such as prepositions, conjunctions, particles, etc. The higher organization of speech calls for fine distinctions which are made possible by new uses of adverbs. Adverbs themselves have various origins as verb, substantive, adjective, pronouns. As a rule the adverb is the fixed case-form like χάριν (freely), which also is used as preposition with genitive. In itself it is merely the accusative of χάρις. But cf. ὁμολογουμένως and even νοννεχῶς.

2. The elements of speech are probably verb, noun, and pronoun. It is not clear which is the earliest, verb or noun. Perhaps now one, now the other arose first. In truth there is little real distinction between a verb root and a noun. Compare the modern English use of the word "work." The pronoun is itself of independent origin and has been remarkably persistent in the Indo-germanic languages. Compare "me," for instance, in the various tongues. This shows the personal and social side of speech. Book language is an afterthought.

3. The adjective is merely a variation of the substantive, both of which are nouns (ὀνόματα). No separate treatment is given to the Sanskrit adjective in Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*. Most of the Sanskrit adjectives have only one or two endings though some have all three genders. Some substantives came to be employed in a descriptive sense like brother man, ἀδελφὸς ἄνθρωπος. Out of this descriptive usage the adjective (ἐπίθετον) grew. The adjective is then strictly an evolution from the substantive and

is often itself used substantively as τὸ ἀγαθόν (Rom. 12:9). The substantive itself continues also to be employed in a descriptive sense. Therefore no hard and fast line of distinction can be drawn between substantive and adjective. They are inflected alike and often are used alike, though for practical purposes a line of cleavage can be noted. Observe ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ (Matt. 3:6). See chapter on Declension of Adjectives for further remarks on this line.

4. The adjective is more developed in Homer than in the Sanskrit and the Greek has its own genius in the use of the adjective. It uses the adjective where other languages might not. So δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν (Acts 28:13). A distinction is to be observed between πρῶτος (Rom. 10:19) and πρῶτον (Jo. 1:41). Cf. πρῶτος in Jo. 20:4,8. So also μόνος (Lu. 24:18) is different from the adverb μόνον (2 Tim. 4:8). Cf. English "feel bad" and "feel badly."

5. The adjective is either predicate or attributive. Take ἀπαράβατον (Heb. 7:24) as an example of the predicate adjective and αἰώνιον (Jo. 6:47) as an example of the attributive adjective.

6. The adjective is rarely used in the superlative form in the N. T. and even then it is usually elative in the sense of "very" as μέγιστα (2 Pet. 1:4). A few examples of the true superlative survive as ἀκριβεστάτην (Acts 26:5). The comparative is often, as in modern Greek, used like the superlative. So μείζων in 1 Cor. 13:13.

7. The adjective is used frequently as an adverb. So πολύ, τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), τὸ λοιπόν, etc. This is probably the earliest and simplest adverb.

8. Adjectives are frequently used without substantives as πνευματικοῖς πνευματικά (1 Cor. 2:13), τῇ ἐπιούσῃ (Acts 16:11). Sometimes only the context can decide what is the gender of the adjective. So ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ (Matt. 6:13).

9. Adjectives may be used with the infinitive as ἱκανὸς βαστάσαι (Matt. 3:11), with ἵνα as ἀρκετὸν ἵνα γένηται (Matt. 10:25), with the associative-instrumental as ὅμοιος ἀνθρώπῳ (Matt. 20:1), with the accusative as ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου (Rev. 14:14), with the ablative as μείζων τοῦ πατρός (Jo. 8:53), with the dative as τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ (Jo.

8:29), ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει (Matt. 5:21), with the genitive as πλήρης χάριτος (Jo. 1:14), etc.

10. Adverbs are either the neuter accusative of an adjective like πολύ, κάλλιον, μάλιστα; the accusative of a substantive like χάριν; the article with an adjective as τὸ πρῶτον, or with a substantive as τὴν ἀρχήν (Jo. 8:25) as an adverbial phrase; or the ablative case of an adjective like καλῶς or pronoun as οὕτως; or some other case of noun or pronoun as πάντῃ (instrumental), ἐκεῖ (locative), etc. Cf. ποίας in Lu. 5:19, and ἐκείνης in Lu. 19:4 as examples of the genitive. Space does not permit a full list of adverbs in the N. T. Cf. τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (Lu. 19:47) and τοὐναντίον (Gal. 2:7).

11. For the use of adverbs as prepositions see chapter on Prepositions. The so-called "improper" prepositions like ἔξω are adverbs as indeed all prepositions are as περί, for instance.

12. Adverbs may be used with the article and thus as the equivalent of substantive (ἕως τοῦ νῦν, Matt. 24:21), or adjective (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, Rom. 3:26).

13. Many prepositional phrases have an adverbial sense like ἀπὸ μέρους (2 Cor. 1:14), εἰς τὸ παντελές (Heb. 7:25).

14. Participles often have an adverbial idea as προσθεὶς εἶπεν (Lu. 19:11).

15. Adverbs may be compared like ἀνώτερον, μάλιστα and compounded like ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ARTICLE.

1. *The indefinite article in Greek.* The Sanskrit and Latin had no article, as the Greek has no indefinite article. Not even in the modern Greek has the indefinite article of the Teutonic and Roman tongues developed, though occasionally εἷς or τὶς is used with little more force than the English a (an). Even in the New Testament we see traces of this use of εἷς as in Matt. 8:19 where εἷς γραμματεὺς is practically equivalent to our "a." In fact, the English one, Scotch ane, French un, German ein is simply the cardinal "one" adapted to this very usage. Children often say: "That was one funny man." So likewise τὶς is used where "certain" is rather too emphatic in English as νομικός τις in Luke 10:25.

2. *The origin of the definite article.* The Sanskrit and Latin did not develop any article at all, and the Greek never developed the indefinite usage to any extent. Moreover, the Greek was slow in creating the definite article, though in Homer we do have the beginning of the article. The forms ὁ, ἡ, τό are occasionally used in Homer with the force of "the," chiefly with adjectives, proper names, or for contrast. It is just in Homer that we see the evolution of the article, for this same form ὁ, ἡ, τό is very common here as a demonstrative and appears also as a relative. Hence ὁ is originally a demonstrative that was gradually weakened to the article or heightened to the relative. This threefold usage of one form is seen in the Ionic, for Herodotus uses the τ forms as demonstrative and relative as well as for the article. And even in the Attic ὁ is preserved occasionally as demonstrative. So in the poets and Plato the demonstrative ὁ appears before relative pronouns (cf. Justin Martyr). The modern Greek often has ὁ ὁποῖος as the relative like old English "the which." In the poetical quotation

in Acts 17:28 τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν we have the demonstrative τοῦ. Such uses as ὁ δέ are common, when the demonstrative is in contrast with a noun usually in an oblique case. So ὁ δὲ εἶπεν (Matt. 14:18). So also in the contrasted expressions οἱ μέν, οἱ δέ (Acts 14:4). In Acts 5:41 οἱ μὲν is used absolutely. We even have ὁ as a relative in the expression ὁ ἦν (Rev. 1:4,8) in harmony with Homeric usage. The Greek relative ὅς ἥ, ὅ which is common in Homer and in the later Greek is demonstrative in origin also though Giles does not think so. So in John 5:11 we read ὃς δὲ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, and in Rom. 14:2 ὃς μὲν πιστεύει. Compare ὃς μέν, ὃς δέ (Rom. 14:5). The contrasted expressions are found in oblique cases as ὃν μέν, ὃν δέ (Luke 23:33). This demonstrative in both forms is the same word as the Sanskrit demonstrative *sá, sā', tád,* where in the masculine and feminine nominative singular the *t* has been softened to *s*. So in Greek this *s* becomes often a rough breathing, (τ)ὁ, (τ)ἥ, τό, and this form then loses the accent. We see it in the Latin *is-te, is-ta, is-tud,* the Gothic *sa, so, thata,* German *der, die, das,* the Anglo-Saxon *se, seo, thaet,* and modern English this, that. In the German and the English we have also the threefold use of the same form as demonstrative, article, relative. In English "the" is a weakened form of "this." But in the New Testament as in the earlier Attic ὁ, ἡ, τό is usually the article and the demonstrative and relative ideas are generally expressed by other words. But the demonstrative use of ὁ continues in the modern Greek as τὸ καὶ τό, this and that. The modern Romance languages obtain their articles from the Latin demonstratives *ille, iste.*

3. *The meaning of the article.* The Greek grammarians call it τὸ ὁριστικὸν ἄρθρον. The English word article comes from the same root as ἄρθρον, viz., ἀραρίσκω, to join. Ἀρ is the root form. This etymology is not very distinctive for many other words join words together. But ὁριστικόν is more to the purpose, for the article does define, limit, point out. It is a pointer, not like the demonstrative, as far and near, this or that, but it simply points out something as the thing in mind. It is natural, if not good manners, for children to point at objects. The article does not tell why a

certain thing is pointed out, but it always points at something. The Greek article points out in one of three ways (Broadus):

(a) Individual objects from other individual objects. Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Matt. 5:1). Then the multitudes in question were those that had come to hear him and the mountain is the one right before him in which he had spent the whole night in prayer (Lu. 6:12), down which he had just come (Lu. 6:17) and up which he now again ascended where he sat down. The Greek article is never used when it has no meaning. We may not be able to see it in the English idiom, but it had its usual force in the Greek. The King James Version does not treat the Greek article properly here and in a great many other passages. The translators were under the influence of the Latin Vulgate. In Luke 4:20 we read καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισεν. Here the roll is the one that Jesus had just read and the attendant is the one who had given it to him. In Luke 18:13 even the Revised Version has translated τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ by "a sinner" and put "the sinner" in the margin. But a large part of the point lies in τῷ. He seemed to himself to be the great sinner of the world as did Paul later (1 Tim. 1:15). In English we also use the article to distinguish individuals from other individuals.

(b) Classes from other classes. Take Matt. 8:20 as an example: Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Here ἀλώπεκες, πετεινὰ, ἀνθρώπου are all classes that are by the article distinguished from other classes. In the case of τοῦ ἀνθρώπου it is the singular that is so used in the collective general sense of man or mankind. The singular is also used with the article in the representative sense as in Luke 10:7 ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. Here ὁ ἐργάτης is the representative of the whole class of laborers. For οἱ ἄνθρωποι in the plural as a class see Matt. 12:36. We use the article in English sometimes to distinguish a class from a class. But even in the Greek the article is not always necessary for this purpose, as ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς (Matt. 5:45).

(c) Qualities from other qualities. The article is not necessary with abstract qualities, but is often so used to sharpen the promi-

nence of the quality or to describe it as previously mentioned. This usage is common in German and French, but is unknown to English save as the quality can be treated as an individual matter already mentioned. So in German *die Weisheit*, in French *la sagesse*, but in English wisdom. In 1 John 4:18 we have good examples of this use of the Greek article. Φόβος is first without the article and then is repeated with the article, while ἀγάπη as the important matter in hand has the article each time. Sometimes this article should be retained in English as in Rev. 4:11 τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν meaning the glory and the honor and the power which God possesses. In Rom. 13:7 we have an interesting study in the use of the article.

4. *What the article is used with.* The article can point out anything that needs further definition. The article will, of course, have the gender of the substantive with which it is used, though any substantive may have the natural, not the grammatical gender ὁ ἀμήν (Rev. 3:14). But see the neuter in Gal. 4:25 where τὸ δὲ Ἅγαρ purposely treats the feminine name as a neuter word. The neuter article is alone used with the infinitive as τὸ δὲ καθίσαι (Mk. 10:40). So the article is used with adjectives with or without substantives as ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (John 10:11), ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 6:69). The article is used also with adverbs without a substantive. In the New Testament τὸ νῦν is very common as in ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (Luke 5:10) and even τὰ νῦν (Acts 27:22). In fact the article can be used with any part of speech as the verb in τὸ δὲ Ἀνέβη (Eph. 4:9), a clause as in τὸ Εἰ δύνῃ (Mark 9:23), a quotation as in τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις (Matt. 19:18), or a sentence as in τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῷ αὐτόν (Luke 22:4). This use of the article with sentences is very common in Luke and is frequent in modern Greek. The article occurs often with the participle as with other adjectives when a substantive is also used as τῇ ἐρχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Acts 21:26) and especially where no substantive appears as in Luke 22:27 where four examples occur, ὁ ἀνακείμενος (twice), ὁ διακονῶν (twice). The article with the participle is a common practical equivalent to a relative clause as in τοῖς πιστεύουσιν (John 1:12) and hence has a larger signification than a mere adjective since the participle has

tense. The article is common with the infinitive as in Mk. 5:4; Matt. 26:2. Often the article is used by itself when the context is clear as in τὰ Καίσαρος (Mark 12:17), ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου (Matt. 10:2). Cf. τὸ τῆς συκῆς (Matt. 21:21).

5. *When the article is not used.* The article is not, of course, used when the idea is indefinite as in μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει (John 4:27). Here the King James Version misses the point by saying "the woman." But a word may be definite without the article, for the article is not the only way of making a thing definite. Proper names, for instance, are definite in the nature of the case and do not require the article to make them so as in πρὸς Βαρνάβαν Παῦλος (Acts 15:36). So when a substantive is used with a genitive it may be sufficiently definite without the article as in πύλαι ᾅδου (Matt. 16:18). This usage is not unknown to earlier Greek and is in the papyri. The Hebrew construct is like it also. But such a word may not be definite as in θεοῦ υἱός (Matt. 27:54). Moreover, some words are definite from the nature of the case as ἐκ νόμου (Rom. 4:14), ὑπὸ Κυρίου (Matt. 1:22), ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου (Matt. 1:21), though these terms for the Deity may have the article like proper names. So also such words as ἥλιος (Matt. 13:6), γῇ (Luke 2:14), θάλασσα (Luke 21:25), Κόσμος (Gal. 6:14), can be definite without the article in English as well as in Greek. See 1 Cor. 8:4 f. for ἐν κόσμῳ, ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἐπὶ γῆς. Besides, a number of words like νόμος (Rom. 2:12), γραφή (1 Pet. 2:6) are so distinctive that they are at times definite without the article. The same is true of a number of familiar phrases in English and Greek like at home (ἐν οἴκῳ or οἶκοι), in town (ἐν πόλει), in church ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, (1 Cor. 14:35), where it is not necessary to say that the article is omitted. It is simply not used because the idea is definite enough without it. So then the Greek article is not used at all unless the word is definite and only then when it is not definite enough to suit the speaker or writer. It is not strictly in accord with the genius of the Greek language to speak of the "omission" of the article, but rather of the non-use of it. See 1 Cor. 3:22 f. for a long list of definite words without the article.

6. *Some special uses of the article.*

(a) The correlation of the article. If a genitive is used with a noun and both have the article, each is unmistakably definite. So Nathanael said to Jesus (John 1:49) Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and likewise Peter (Matt. 16:16). A proper name in such a case does not always have the article as μετὰ τὴν μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος (Matt. 1:12). But where one of the words is without the article it is indefinite as in εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt. 4:3) where Satan assumes that Jesus is a son of God. But in a case like θεοῦ υἱὸς (Matt. 27:54), both words may be indefinite or both definite and only the context or nature of the words can decide. Compare υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt. 27:40) and θεοῦ υἱός (Matt. 27:43). In John 10:36, when meeting a criticism of his enemies, Jesus calls himself υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, though elsewhere he says ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (John 5:25).

(b) The article with attributives. There are three kinds of attributive expressions with which the article has to do.

(1) Adjectives. The attributive adjective is preceded by the article, though the adjective itself may precede the substantive, if one is used, as in τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα (Matt. 18:20), or follow the substantive as in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (John 10:11). But in ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς (John 12:9,12) πολὺς appears to be attributive in idea like the French use of the adjective without the article as *la république Française*. But in Mark 12:37 we have ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος (compare ὄχλος πολὺς in Mark 5:21). Perhaps this usage grew by analogy out of the common construction of πᾶς, ὅλος, οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος. If no article is used with an adjective, it may still be attributive as μικρὰ ζύμη (1 Cor. 5:6).

(2) With genitives. From the nature of the case genitives are generally attributive whether the article is used or not, though the genitive is predicate after εἰμί, γίνομαι, etc. So οἰκοδομὴ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 3:9), κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 3:10), τὸ κήρυγμά μου (1 Cor. 2:4). This is true whatever the position of the genitive, whether as above or preceded by the article as in μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ παθημάτων (1 Pet. 5;1), and in τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι (Rom. 3:24). The article may be added for the sake of distinction as in Μαρία ἡ τοῦ

Κλωπᾶ (John 19:25) or repeated for emphasis as in ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. 1:18).

(3) With adjuncts. When the adjunct has the article before it, the phrase is, of course, attributive, as in τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Rom. 8:1), διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Rom. 3:24). But if no article is used, then the adjunct may be either predicate as ἐν τῇ σαρκί (Rom. 8:3) which goes with κατέκρινε (not τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, for Christ has no sin in his flesh) or attributive as εἰς τὸν θάνατον (Rom. 6:4) where this phrase goes with διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος (see preceding verse). Often the tone of voice will show that a phrase is attributive as οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον (1 Thess. 4:16), ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ (Luke 16:10). The one article can be used with any number of attributives (2 Pet. 1:4).

(c) The repetition of the article. It is not necessary for the article to be used only once when there are a number of predicates, though this is a neat Greek idiom, as in 2 Peter 3:15 where we have τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε. Sometimes the article is repeated in such examples (cf. Attic) as in τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα (1 Pet. 4:14). Sometimes the article is used with the attributive and not with the substantive as in ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (2 Tim. 1:13). It is very common to have the double article thus ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς (John 7:6), ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός (Matt. 3:17). The article can be repeated with each attributive as τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν (Rev. 2:12). But the article is not repeated quite indiscriminately. When several connected nouns relating to different objects differ in gender, they take separate articles even if they have the same case and number, as in ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου (Rom. 8:2), unless indeed the ideas are close akin as in ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ κυρίου (Luke 1:6) where one article suffices. Two substantives that agree in number, gender, and case, and that refer to different objects may be grouped under one article and so viewed as one, though not in reality, as in οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι (Matt. 16:1), whereas we usually have οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς (Mark 7:5), the one a party and the other a profession, though most of the scribes were Pharisees. So Jesus says ὁ σπείρων καὶ ὁ θερίζων (John

4:36) to emphasize the distinctness of the two persons. But when two substantives relate to the same person, it is not usual to repeat the article, as Ἐγὼ Ἰωάνης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συνκοινωνὸς (Rev. 1:9). Cf. Rev. 3:17. So in 2 Pet. 1:11 (and also 2:20; 3:18) we have τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Here the one article definitely shows Jesus Christ to be both our Lord and Savior. Hence in 2 Pet. 1:1 τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ the article likewise means that Christ is our God and Savior. Winer departs from his usual rectitude in not insisting on strict grammar for 2 Pet. 1:1. So also on doctrinal grounds he denies the force of the one article in Titus 2:13 ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. But Paul's doctrinal system in Phil. 2:9 and Col. 1:15-19; 2:9, not to mention Rom. 9:5 and Acts 20:28, does not forbid the natural import of the one article here.

(d) The article with predicates. When the noun has the article and the adjective does not, it is generally predicate. So in μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (Acts 26:24) Luke means that he spoke with the voice loud and elevated. In Heb. 7:24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην does not mean that he has the unchangeable priesthood, but he has the priesthood unchangeable. As a rule the article is not used with the predicate noun even when the subject is definite. Cf. Mk. 3:1. 1 John 4:16 Ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν God is love, but love is not God. Thus we can tell subject from predicate. Hence in John 1:1 θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος we translate the Word was God, not God was the Word, for subject and predicate are not here co-extensive. But if the predicate is previously well known or is identical with the subject (W. F. Moulton in note to translation of Winer), the article is used. So in Acts 21:38 οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος. Here ὁ refers to the well-known leader of the four thousand insurrectionists. In 1 John 3:4 ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία has the article twice because subject and predicate are interchangeable. So in John 3:10 Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος shows Nicodemus to be the well-known teacher.

(e) The article with proper names. This peculiarity of Greek persists to the present day. The article is not always used with proper names and no wholly satisfactory remark can be made about it. Thus in Acts 19:1 we have τὸν Ἀπολλὼ εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ

Παῦλον. Often we can do nothing with this article in the English idiom, but in an example like that in Acts 19:13 we can see the point as Ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει. Here the exorcist seeks to identify Jesus to the demon by the article, "the Jesus whom Paul preaches." The article will often be used with the noun in apposition to the proper name, but not with the proper name as Ἰωάνης ὁ Βαπτιστὴς (Matt. 3:1).

(f) The article with pronouns. The genitive of personal pronouns may or may not have the article as Θεέ μου (Matt. 27:46), τὸν πατέρα μου (Matt. 26:53). The pronoun, again, may rarely come after the article as τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι (Rom. 3:24). Or the article may not appear at all as φίλοι μου (Jo. 15:14), δούλους ἑαυτοῦ (Lu. 19:13). The article is sometimes used with the possessive pronoun as ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι (Matt. 7:22). But the article never means possession. Where it is said of Pilate that ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας, it is the hands, which were, of course, his own. Ἕκαστος never uses the article in the New Testament (1 Cor. 3:8). We have τὸν δεῖνα once (Matt. 26:18). Ἴδιος outside of ἰδίᾳ and κατ' ἰδίαν has the article uniformly as οἱ ἴδιοι (John 1:11). Τοιοῦτος is used with the article, though not always, as οἱ τοιοῦτοι (Rom. 16:18). Once we have αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται (Mark 6:2). Once also the article occurs with τοσοῦτος as ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος (Rev. 18:17). The New Testament follows the Greek custom in using the article with οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος, though to us it is an anomaly. Perhaps the demonstrative was felt to be so definite that the very atmosphere called for the article. The article, moreover, is generally used with the noun and not with the demonstrative, though the force of the demonstrative seems to be attributive, not predicate. So οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Luke 14:30). Even with proper names οὗτος is generally used with the article as οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Acts 1:11). So when οὗτος is not used with the article it is predicate, not attributive, as ταύτας ἡμέρας (Acts 1:5), days these (hence). Cf. Acts 24:21. Thus in John 2:11 ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων means that he did this as a beginning of miracles.

(g) The article with πᾶς. Without the article in the singular πᾶς is "every" as πάντα πειρασμόν (Luke 4:13). But in the case of

abstract nouns "every" is tantamount to all as πᾶσαν χαράν (Jas. 1:2). So also if it is a proper name and hence a single object as πᾶσα Ἰερουσόλυμα (Matt. 2:3). Since γραφή was sometimes regarded as definite without the article πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16 may be "all Scripture," though it may also be "every Scripture," since the point is not clear. There is a difference between πᾶσα ἡ πόλις (Matt. 8:34) and ἡ πᾶσα πόλις, though this latter construction is found only twice (Green) in the New Testament (Acts 20:18 τὸν πάντα χρόνον, and 1 Tim. 1:16 τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν). In Matt. 7:26 πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων is equivalent to πᾶς ὅστις ἀκούει (Matt. 7:24). The plural πάντες preserves the distinction this far that the article before (οἱ πάντες) groups the sum total as τὰ πάντα (Col. 1:16). Ὅλος is used generally with the article as ὅλος ὁ κόσμος (Rom. 1:8). In John 9:34 we have ὅλος in the predicate without the article, ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος, you were begotten in sins the whole of you. But in general the article in the New Testament is true to the genius of the Greek tongue and it is not possible to appreciate the Greek article save as one is in sympathy with the Greek as a living idiom.

(h) The article with μέσος. In the New Testament we have commonly τὸ μέσον, εἰς μέσον, ἐν μέσῳ, κατὰ μέσον, as ἐν μέσῳ λύκων (Matt. 10:16). But we have also the old construction μέσης νυκτός, in the middle of the night (Matt. 25:6). Ἄκρος is not used in this way, though we have τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου (Luke 16:24).

(i) The article with the nominative as vocative. Here we have an old Greek idiom intensified by the Hebrew and Aramaic usage in which tongues the vocative regularly uses the article. In the New Testament a number of examples occur, as ναὶ ὁ πατήρ (Matt. 11:26); ἀββά ὁ πατήρ (Mk. 14:36); τὸ κοράσιον (Mk. 5:41). The form is nominative, but the case is really vocative.

CHAPTER XIII.

PRONOUNS.

1. *What is the pronoun* (*πρὸ ὀνόματος, pro nomine*)*?* The pronoun is a device to prevent the constant repetition of the noun. In modern English we much dislike the repetition of the same word whether verb or noun. Macaulay is criticized for using the substantive too much. But the noun should always be used where necessary to avoid ambiguity. In English we even dislike too frequent use of the pronoun.

2. *Persistence of pronouns.* As already noticed, the pronominal roots are, many of them, very old, perhaps as old as the oldest verbal roots. The pronouns have been the most persistent parts of speech as to retention of case-forms. We see this in the English he, his, him, etc. But a complete set of pronouns in all respects was not developed. In the vernacular new pronouns continually arose from time to time.

3. *Emphasis.* In Greek the pronoun is not so common as in the modern European tongues. The Greek verb itself contains the personal subject, and even the oblique case of the pronoun was not always used. When, therefore, the nominative case of the pronoun is used, there is emphasis. Cf. *ἐγώ* (Matt. 5:22), *σύ* (John 1:42), *ὑμεῖς* (Matt. 27:24). In the New Testament the pronoun, as in the *κοινή* and the Hebrew, occurs much more frequently than in earlier Greek. But there is still some emphasis, except in the redundant pronoun as in Rev. 7:2 (*αὐτοῖς*). It may be very slight, however, merely a change of tone. See Mark 1:8 (*αὐτὸς*); Matt. 1:21 (*αὐτὸς*); 8:24 (*αὐτὸς*); Acts 20:35 (*αὐτὸς*). In *αὐτὸς* the emphasis is occasionally very slight, if at all, but we must always look for it. See Lu. 1:22; 6:8; 15:14; 24:25,31. The literary plural appears also as in *γράφομεν* (1 Jo. 1:4). Cf. *γράφω* in 1 Jo. 2:12.

4. Αὐτός *in predicate.* In Luke we find a very common idiom that is reproduced in modern Greek. It is the use of αὐτός in the predicate position and translated by "that very." See Lu. 13:31, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. Strictly it is (in this example) "the hour itself," but there is a shading to the demonstrative force as in modern Greek. But this is not true of Matt. 3:4, which the King James Version mistranslated αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάνης.

5. *Position.* Sometimes the pronoun occupies an emphatic position like σὺ τίς (Rom. 14:4), σὺ πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις (Rom. 14:22). Note the contrast in ἐγώ σε (Jo. 17:4), με σύ (Jo. 17:5), etc. But sometimes the unusual position is for euphony, not emphasis, as with αὐτοῦ (John 9:6). Cf. μου and σου in Jo. 9:10,11,17, etc. Cf. αὐτός μου ἀδελφός (Matt. 12:50). See also Matt. 8:8.

6. *Omission.* Hadley and Allen speak of the "omission" of the pronoun when there is no emphasis. This is to speak from the standpoint of the English. It is proper to say the pronoun is simply not used in Greek when it is not needed. Each writer, to be sure, decides for himself whether he will use the pronoun in a given instance. It only confuses things to say that he "omitted" a pronoun when he simply did not need it for his idea.

7. *Third personal pronoun.* The New Testament has a very simple usage for the third personal pronoun in the oblique cases. Αὐτός (Lu. 4:20) is the word, never οὗ, the old reflexive form, and usually in the oblique cases. This is, of course, just one of the early uses of αὐτός. Sometimes, as in Lu. 19:2 (καὶ αὐτός) the nominative form has this sense of emphatic he. But for the other use see Matt. 1:21 (αὐτός). Ὁ αὐτός is still frequent as "the same" (Matt. 5:46). Cf. τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα (2 Cor. 4:13) and αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα (Rom. 8:26). The intensive use of αὐτός, though not very common, survives as αὐτὸς γὰρ Δανεὶδ (Lu. 20:42). Cf. also αὐτὸς ἐγώ (Rom. 7:25), αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς (1 Th. 4:9).

8. *The reflexive.* This pronoun holds its own in all three persons in the singular and to some extent in the plural as ἐμαυτοῦ (Jo. 5:30), σεαυτόν (Matt. 4:6), ἑαυτῆς (Matt. 12:25). In the plural ἑαυτῶν occurs indiscriminately for either person, the first (Rom. 8:23), the second (Rom. 6:11), the third (Rom. 5:8). But ὑμῶν

αὐτῶν appears in 1 Cor 7:35 and ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς in 1 Cor. 11:13. Αὐτόν is not common, though necessary occasionally as in Jo. 2:24, a good example (αὐτός, αὐτόν, αὐτοῖς). Ἑαυτοῦ may be with the article (Lu. 11:21) or without (Lu. 13:19). The position may even be ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια (Matt. 21:8). But instead of the reflexive we have the personal form as ὑμῖν (Matt. 6:19). Ἴδιος (cf. ἰδιώτης, Acts 4:13) is common in the N. T. as in the κοινή. So τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον (Acts 1:25).

9. *Possessive.* The various ways of expressing possession are all distinctive. The article does not *mean* possession. In such a case, where only the article is used, the idea of possession is considered clear enough. If you say "I have a pain in the head," it is perfectly clear whose head it is. But "the" does not mean "my." So John 2:11 (τῶν). The possessive pronoun without the article is less distinctive than with it. See John 4:34 (ἐμὸν); 13:35 (ἐμοὶ). For the possessive pronoun with the article see John 7:8 (ὁ ἐμὸς); Lu. 22:19 (τὴν ἐμὴν). The possessive is not used in the third person in the New Testament, but the genitive of αὐτός (Matt. 1:2). In the first and second person the genitive thus used may be either emphatic or unemphatic according to the form (enclitic) and the presence or absence of the article. See Matt. 7:3-5 (σου and σοῦ); John 14:2 (μου). In Matt. 7;3 note also τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ. In general the possessive pronoun is rare in the N. T. save ἐμός in John's Gospel (as above, but see Phil. 3:9). The possessive pronoun may have a genitive in apposition with it as τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου (1 Cor. 16:21).

10. *Demonstrative.* The usual demonstratives are found in the New Testament though οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος are the only ones that have much frequency. The customary distinction between these two obtains. In the case of οὗτος the absence of the article means the predicate idea as in Jo. 2:11; Acts 1:5. But in περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς (Acts 24:21) we come close to the attributive usage though the article is absent. The epexegetic use of τοῦτο (καὶ τοῦτο) is seen in 1 Cor. 6:8. The demonstrative rarely appears as the direct antecedent of the relative as οὗτος ὅς (Lu. 5:21). The contemptuous idea is conveyed by οὗτος in Acts 17:18; 19:26. Interesting is the

resumptive use of οὗτος as in Matt. 10:22. Ὅδε is nearly confined to the form τάδε (Rev. 2:1), but note Jas. 4:13. The peculiar δεῖνα occurs only once (Matt. 26:18). Ἐκεῖνος is sometimes an emphatic subject (he) as in Jo. 5:35,46; 19:35; Matt. 15:18. For distinction between οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος see Lu. 18:14. For the dem. ὅς see ὃς δέ (Jo. 5:11), ὃς μέν, ὃς δέ (1 Cor. 11:21). For ὁ δέ see Rom. 14:2; Eph. 4:11.

11. *Relative.* The relative pronoun is not well named, since all pronouns as many other words express relation. However the usual agreement in number and gender between the relative and its antecedent justifies the name. The bond is thus very close. The occasional union of case by attraction is a still closer bond in the same direction, as οἷς in Lu. 2:20. But attraction is not necessary as we see in ἣν (Heb. 8:2). ὅστις, besides the usual indefinite sense as in Matt. 13:12 and Lu. 12:1, often assumes a strongly definite idea (compare two ideas in τὶς). So Lu. 2:4; Acts 10:47. For the suppression of the antecedent see οὗ (Rom. 10:14). The absence of the antecedent is not a peculiarity of Greek, but belongs to all languages. Compare the English "who gives quickly gives twice." Note ᾧ in Lu. 7:47. Cf. even αὐτοῖς (Matt. 8:4) with no substantive in the context. Sometimes indeed the antecedent is incorporated into the relative clause and both are in the same case as in εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς (Rom. 6:17). Cf. Lu. 1:20 and Mk. 6:16. Note τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὅς in Luke 5:21, but cf. Rom. 7:15. The attraction of the relative to the case of the antecedent is specially common in Luke (cf. ὧν in 5:9) which is not surprising as it is one of the finer and subtler points of syntax. It occurs twice only in Matt. (18:19; 24:50) and once in Mark (7:13). Cf. Plummer on Luke, p. li. Usually this attraction is from the acc. to some other oblique case, but sometimes other cases than the acc. experience it. Cf. ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς (Acts 1:22) where a locative becomes gen. See also 2 Cor. 1:4. This attraction may be inverse from antecedent to the case of the relative. Thus τὸν ἄρτον ὅν (1 Cor. 10:16) and παντὶ ᾧ (Lu. 12:48). The relative usually agrees with its antecedent in gender and number, but this bond is often broken if the sense justifies it. In Mk. 15:16 ὃ agrees

in gender with the predicate πραιτώριον rather tnan with the antecedent τῆς αὐλῆς. In Phil. 2:15 οἷς differs in number and gender from γενεᾶς. See also ὅ in Eph. 5:5, and ὅς in Eph. 1:14 (mg. ὅ text of W H), and 1 Tim. 3:16. There is a real agreement in sense, however, which is more important than mere formal grammatical structure. But οὗτος (Matt. 7:12) is strictly grammatical. In 1 Cor. 15:10 Paul purposely says εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμι, not ὅς. Ὅστις like ὅς is very common in the N. T., but it is nearly confined to the nominative, but see acc. neuter ὅτι in Lu. 10:35. Cf. also ἕως ὅτου. Ὅσος is frequent as in Matt. 7:12, but οἷος (1 Thess. 1:5) is rare, and ἡλίκος appears only four times (cf. James 3:5). For τοσούτῳ—ὅσῳ see Heb. 1:4. Cf. καθ' ὅσον (Heb. 7:20) and ὅσον ὅσον (Heb. 10:37). In Rom. 9:6 we have the old classic idiom οὐχ οἷον ὅτι where οἷος almost equals δυνατός. The repetition of the relative is well shown in Phil. 4:8 (ὅσα). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:1f. As in Latin sometimes the relative occurs at the beginning of sentences as ἀνθ' ὧν (Lu. 12:3), ἐν οἷς (Lu. 12:1), οὗ χάριν (Lu. 7:47). This classical idiom is more frequent in Luke. In Rev. 1:4 ὁ ἦν occurs where ὁ is relative.

12. *Correlative pronouns.* They are not very common in the N. T. Τοῖος does not appear at all and τοιόσδε once (2 Pet. 1:17). Τοιοῦτος (neuter τοιοῦτο) occurs about sixty times either with the article as οἱ τοιοῦτοι (Rom. 16:18) or without as τοιοῦτο (Matt. 18:5). In Rev. 16:18 we even find οἷος οὐκ ἐγένετο τηλικοῦτος σεισμὸς οὕτω μέγας where the same idea occurs twice. Cf. θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη (Mk. 13:19). In Acts 26:29 note τοιούτους ὁποῖος. And in 1 Cor. 5:1 observe τοιαύτη ἥτις. Τοσοῦτος (cf. Lu. 7:9) is less common and always without the article save once ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος (Rev. 18:16).

13. *The indefinite pronoun.* In Greek the indefinite is the same form as the interrogative save the accent. Τὶς is very common in the New Testament with a substantive as ἱερεύς τις (Lu. 1:5) or without as εἴ τις ἔχει (Mk. 4:23). It may occur at the beginning of a sentence as in τινὲς δέ (Acts 17:18). It can be used also for the emphatic idea of somebody or something as εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναί τι, μηδὲν ὤν, φρεναπατεῖ (Gal. 6:3) where both senses occur. Cf.

Acts 5:36. In Mk. 10:17 εἷς seems to be the equivalent of τις. We even have εἷς τις together (Mark 14:47; John 11:49). Τις at times is almost equal to "a kind of" as εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχήν τινα (Jas. 1:18), and with numbers τις generalizes the expression as δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν (Lu. 7:19). In ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος (Rev. 21:21) we have a distributive idiom and the adverbial use of ἀνά.

14. *The interrogative pronouns.* Τίς is, of course, the usual interrogative pronoun in the New Testament, as τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν (Matt. 3:7). For the double interrogative τίς τί see Mk. 15:24. It is used in alternative questions instead of πότερος as τίς ἐκ τῶν, etc., (Matt. 21:31), Τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν; (Matt. 27:17). So τίς . . . . ἤ (Matt. 23:17). In τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; (Luke 16:12) we have rather a predicate use of τοῦτο than any peculiar use of τί. Τί ὅτι occurs by itself as τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτε (Lu. 2:50), but the copula ἐστίν or γέγονεν may be merely dropped out for see τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ; (John 14:22). The same thing is true of ἵνα τί (ἵνα τί in quotations from the Old Testament as Acts 4:25) as ἵνα τί ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρά; (Matt. 9:4). Τί is used with any of the prepositions as διὰ τί (Matt. 9:11), and sometimes τί by itself is in the accusative, as to what, and so why, as τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος; (Matt. 7:3). Sometimes this adverbial use of τί borders close on to our "how" as in Luke 2:49 above and in Acts 5:4 τί ὅτι ἔθου and in Acts 5:9 τί ὅτι συνεφωνήθη. In Luke 12:49 we have a more difficult passage, πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη; Here "how I wish" makes far better sense, though it is a very unusual use of the interrogative form as an exclamation. In Acts 13:25 the neuter τί is used rather than τίνα (attested by some manuscripts) like the modern Greek idiom, τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; There is nothing peculiar in the common use of τίς (τί) ἄρα, or οὖν, or γάρ. See Paul's τί οὖν by itself (Rom. 6:15). Τίς has no effect on the construction of the sentence and in Acts 17:18 τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; we have merely the conclusion of a fourth class condition. Πότερος is not used in direct questions in the New Testament. It is urged by some writers that in Matt. 7:14, Mark 9:11,28, and possibly also John 8:25 we have ὅτι used as a direct

interrogative. This is more than doubtful. It is more likely that the phrase τί ὅτι has been here condensed into ὅτι and the ellipse is carried still further as sometimes ἵνα is used with no preceding verb. It is even suggested that in Matt. 26:50 ἐφ' ὃ πάρει is a case of ὅ as a direct interrogative, but here again it is better to understand an ellipse. Cf. the prolepsis σὲ τίς (Mk. 1:24) where the interr. is almost equivalent to the relative. Πηλίκος is not used as a direct interrogative. Ποῖος is like the Latin *qualis* and is used in direct question fairly often in the New Testament, as ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; (Mark 11:28). So πόσος is still the word for quantitative questions as πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; (Mark 6:38). In indirect questions the New Testament does not so well follow the usage of the earlier Greek so far as the pronouns are concerned. Ὅστις is so used only once, viz., in Acts 9:6, καί λαληθήσεταί σοι ὅ τι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. Πότερον, not πότερος, occurs once only, disappearing like the English whether (Simcox), viz., πότερον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἢ ἐγώ (John 7:17). Πηλίκος appears twice (Gal. 6:11; Heb. 7:4), and one (Gal. 6:11) is not certain, ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα. Πόσος is so employed a few times, as ἴδε πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν (Mark 15:4). Ποῖος is also in use in indirect questions, as οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται (Matt. 24:42) Ὁποῖος four times occurs in this construction, but once (Acts 26:29) as usual relative, τοιούτους ὁποῖος (Blass in error here). As example of indirect question see Jas. 1:24, εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν. But in the New Testament the great majority of indirect questions that use a pronoun have τίς, contrary to the usual earlier usage (Alexandrian, says Blass. So in papyri), as οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε (Matt. 20:22). Cf. Matt. 15:32. Sometimes the relative and the indirect interrogative are used side by side, but there is a difference, as in 1 Tim. 1:7, μὴ νοοῦντες μή τε ἃ λέγουσιν μή τε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται. Sometimes τί is used where it verges close on to the relative idea, yet not quite, as δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε (Matt. 10;19). This is really an indirect question which is, however, the subject of δοθήσεται. Winer is doubtless correct in saying that Latin would here have *quod* (not *quid*) *dicatis*, but the Greek follows its own genius. So also in a case like Mark 1:24, οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, the indirect

question is in the accusative, a sort of apposition to σε the object of οἶδα. Thus we explain also ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστιν (Luke 19:3). The double interrogative properly occurs also in indirect questions as τίς τί ἄρῃ (Mark 15:24). But the relative and the interrogative at times are almost interchangeable in the κοινή.

15. *Reciprocal pronouns.* The familiar ἄλλος ἄλλο is also found as Acts 19:32. The distinction between ἕτερος and ἄλλος is observed to some extent in the New Testament. See Gal. 1:6 f.; 2 Cor. 11:4. But in εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην (Lu. 9:56) we have ἕτερος in the sense only of a second, not of a different kind. And in Lu. 19:20 ὁ ἕτερος is used after ὁ δεύτερος (19:18) as the next (a third). Compare ὁ εἷς, ὁ ἕτερος (Matt. 6:24). In Rom. 2:1 ὁ ἕτερος is practically neighbor. The reciprocal idea is also set forth by εἷς (1 Cor. 4:6) and ἑαυτῶν (1 Cor. 6:7), as well as by the usual ἀλλήλων (Matt. 24:10; Lu. 2:15).

16. In alternative expressions we have τις . . . . τις as τινὲς μὲν . . . . τινὲς δὲ (Phil. 1:15); τις . . . . ἄλλος as ὑπὸ τινῶν . . . . ἄλλων (Luke 9:7 f.); τις . . . . ἕτερος (1 Cor. 3:4); εἷς . . . . εἷς (Mark 10:37); εἷς μὲν . . . . ὁ δὲ as μία μὲν . . . . τὸ δὲ (Gal. 4:24); ὁ εἷς (or εἷς . . . . ὁ ἕτερος (Matt. 6:24). The negative forms οὔτις, μήτις do not occur in the New Testament save that μήτι is used in questions as μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κύριε; (Matt. 26:22). Westcott and Hort print μή τις as in John 15:6. Οὐδείς is very common either alone as οὐδεὶς δύναται (Matt. 6:24) or with a substantive as οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται (Lu. 16:13). Μηδείς is not so frequent, but is used as formerly; so μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω (Matt. 9:30); ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν (Acts 25:17). Sometimes the negative is separated from the pronoun like the Hebrew as ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται (Matt. 10:29), but the resultant idea is the same. So sometimes οὐ . . . . πᾶς as οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ (Rom. 3:20) and rarely μή . . . . πᾶς (1 Cor. 1:29). Πᾶς . . . . οὐ (1 Jo. 1:21) and πᾶς . . . . μή (John 3:16) do not depart from the usual idiom. So οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων (Matt. 7:21) is in full accord with the usual idiom.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CASES.

1. *Cases in the Indo-germanic tongues.*

(a) There are eight well defined cases in the Sanskrit, the oldest member of this group of languages, viz., the nominative, the vocative, the accusative, the genitive, the ablative, the locative, the instrumental, the dative. These eight cases, with the exception of the vocative, have, as a rule, separate case suffixes. It is possible that the oldest Sanskrit had another case, the associative, which was merged into the instrumental. But Giles (*Comparative Philology*, p. 269) suggests that the difference in sense between instrument and association may be due not to two cases, but to the distinction between inanimate and animate objects (instruments and companions).

(b) These eight cases have had a varied history in all the Indo-germanic languages. The Russian language still has eight case-forms. In Latin the eight cases have six distinct case-forms, the ablative, instrumental and locative appearing under one termination, *i* or *e* in the singular, *is* or *ibus* in the plural. The Gothic has only four separate case-forms, dative, locative, ablative, and instrumental all being alike and the vocative now like nominative and now like accusative. The German still has five case-forms (nominative, vocative, genitive, accusative, dative). The Anglo-Saxon preserved six distinct case-forms and in some words all eight. A few Anglo-Saxon words have the locative and ablative endings, though in general these cases have been blended with the dative and the instrumental (March, *Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language*, p. 148). In modern English, outside of the personal pronouns, the eight case-forms have all disappeared save the genitive *s* and that is sometimes represented by the apostophe and is

often displaced by the preposition of. In French, outside of the pronouns, there is no case-form at all. In the Greek the eight cases appear under five case-forms, the genitive and the ablative having the same endings, while the locative, instrumental, and dative have the same terminations. In the modern Greek vernacular even the locative, instrumental, dative cases disappear, εἰς and the accusative being used instead. So modern Greek vernacular has only three case-forms, nominative, accusative, and genitive.

(c) The kinship between the chief Indo-germanic tongues in the cases will be readily seen from the table of Sanskrit case-endings (omitting the dual):

	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
	m. f. n.	m. f. n.
N.	*s* or —	*as* or *i*
V.	—	—
Acc.	*am* or —	*as* or *i*
G.	*as*	*ām*
Ab.	*as*	*bhyas*
D.	*e*(*ai*)	*bhyas*
I.	*ā* or *bhi*	*bhis*(*ois*)
L.	*i*	*su*

The similarity of these endings to Greek and Latin case endings is at once apparent. The identity of the genitive and ablative singular ending *as* (like the Greek ος) is at once noticeable and is imitated by the Greek in the plural also. Again the identity of the ablative and dative plural *bhyas* is like the Latin *bus* in dative, ablative, locative, and the instrumental (sometimes *is* like *su* or instrumental *ois*), an identity observable in the Latin singular also in most words. So then the Greek genitive and ablative follow the Sanskrit singular while the Latin ablative, locative, instrumental, and dative proceed along the line of the Sanskrit plural for these cases. In Sanskrit, as in all the Indo-germanic tongues, the vocative has no case-endings. Like Latin and Greek neuters, the nom-

inative, accusative, and vocative in Sanskrit are alike. The Greek, unlike the Sanskrit and the Latin, makes the accusative plural in most cases (masculine and feminine) different from the nominative. In neuter nouns in Greek there are, therefore, only three distinct case-forms. Remnants of distinctive ablative, locative, and instrumental endings are preserved in Greek.

2. *The origin and use of the cases.*

(a) The word case (*casus*, πτῶσις) means falling. It is the inflection of the noun by case endings, though some nouns are indeclinable.

(b) The object of cases is to express the relation of words in a sentence. In the isolating languages (like the Chinese) this relation is shown by the order of the words and the tone in pronunciation. In the old Sanskrit this relation was expressed by means of the eight cases and no prepositions were used till very late. In modern English and French prepositions have practically displaced the cases and the Chinese plan of relying on the position of the words is largely used. The Greek and the Latin come in half way between and exhibit all these tendencies.

(c) The burden upon the cases was felt to be too great even in the later Sanskrit and a number of set case-forms (adverbs) came to be used with most of the cases to make clearer the relation of words to words. Thus a few prepositions gradually arose even in Sanskrit. In the Greek and Latin this tendency to use a preposition to define more sharply the idea of the case grew rapidly. Even in the Coptic there are no case-forms, but only particles and prepositions. "These adverbs, which we now call prepositions, in time become the constant concomitants of some cases; and when this has happened, there is an ever-increasing tendency to find the important part of the meaning in the preposition and not in the case ending" (Giles, *Comparative Philology*, p. 272 f.). The rise of prepositions, therefore, marks the beginning of the decline of the case system.

(d) There is thus a constant tendency in all the Indo-germanic languages to blend various cases into one case-form and so to lessen the number of case-forms. The increasing use of prepositions is in

harmony with the analytical process in language growth. But for the increasing use of prepositions this would have resulted in greater confusion than ever. Prof. J. H. Moulton seems to go too far when he says; "In other words, the purely local cases, in which the meaning could be brought out by a place adverb (for this purpose called a preposition), sacrificed their distinct forms and usages."

(e) As it is, the distinctive idea of each case remains practically what it was originally even when several cases are blended together. Grammarians have made hopeless efforts to derive the Greek genitive from the ablative or the ablative from the genitive. Both ideas are manifestly expressed by the same case-ending, but historically they are different cases and express different ideas. So it is with the locative, instrumental and dative. The Sanskrit had practically distinct endings and clearly distinct ideas for each case. Greek and Latin have distinct case ideas, but not distinct endings for all eight cases. The proper historical method for studying the Greek cases is to see which one of the eight a given case is, appeal to the original meaning of that case, note the bearing of the particular context on that meaning, take note of the history of the case, and the resultant idea will be the truth expressed.

(f) We do not know certainly the origin of the case-forms themselves. They are either pronominal as the nominative and accusative or local as the ablative and locative. But it is all speculation, since in the oldest Sanskrit the case-forms do not appear apart from the nouns. In general, it is to be observed that the ablative was the earliest case to lose its case-form, while the genitive has been the most tenacious of its endings in all the languages. The accusative is the oldest of all the cases. But in the New Testament, as in the older Greek, the real idea of each of the eight cases is manifest, though the process of blending has made further progress as is seen in the practical equivalence of εἰς and accusative and ἐν (the locative) with verbs of rest and motion. The practical absence of cases in the Hebrew would accentuate this tendency to some extent.

(g) Winer is clearly correct (*Grammar of the Idiom of the N. T.*,

Winer-Thayer, p. 180,) when he says: "No case is ever in reality put for another (*enallage casuum*). Sometimes, however, two cases can be used with equal correctness in one and the same connection when the relation to be expressed may be viewed in two different ways." That is true and important.

3. *The nominative.*

(a) The ending *s* is thought to be demonstrative like Sanskrit *sá's*. This case is treated first (called *prathamâ*, first, by the Hindu grammarians), though it is not the first in order of time.

(b) It has come to be the case of the subject, but it was not originally that, for the old subject was part of the verb as φη-μί, I say. The addition of a noun or pronoun in apposition with this verbal subject, as ἐγώ, is a later development due to desire for greater accuracy and clearness. It is unscientific, then, to speak of the "omission of the subject" in such cases as is done, for instance, by Hadley and Allen (*Greek Grammar*, p. 203). Even the so-called "impersonal" verb has a subject in the verb itself as ὕει, καλῶς ἔχει.

(c) In Greek, then, the nominative, the naming case (πτῶσις ὀνομαστική) is properly appositional both when subject of a verb and when in the predicate as σὺ εἶ Πέτρος (Matt. 16:18). Here the verb has become copula merely and Πέτρος is predicate, but that is not always true as ἐγώ εἰμι (John 8:58). But instead of the predicate nominative we often have εἰς and the accusative as in the Attic Greek. So ἐγένετο εἰς τρία μέρη (Rev. 16:19). This is very common in the Septuagint. English likewise can say: It is me, and French c' est moi. Compare Latin, *dedecori est.* This appositional force of the nominative is often clearly seen in such examples as Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος παρακαλῶ (2 Cor. 10:1).

(d) The nominative is thus sometimes retained even when in apposition with other cases, as in John 13:13, φωνεῖτέ με ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ κύριος, where it is practically a quotation. So in Rev. 1:4 the nominative is retained even after the preposition ἀπὸ as if to emphasize the unchangeable nature of God, ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. In the Revelation of John indeed this retention of the nominative in apposition with an oblique case is so frequent as to

become noticeable, especially participial clauses, as τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα (Rev. 3:12).

(e) Moreover, the nominative is used where it is not connected with the rest of the sentence. In a way the nominative "has a certain tendency to be residuary legatee of case-relations not obviously appropriated by the other cases" (Moulton, *Expositor*, August, 1904). So in salutations the nominative is used as a matter of course, as Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (1 Cor. 1:1). Sometimes the structure is changed and the nominative is left suspended as ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ (Rev. 3:21). Other examples of broken structure with the nominative are ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς (Matt. 15:32), πρασιαὶ πρασιαί (Mark 6:40), ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν (Matt. 3:17), ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης (John 1:6). This "parenthetic nominative" (Moulton) is common in the papyri. As a matter of fact these "nominatives absolute are the most frequent and the most distinctly marked" (Winer) of any of the absolute uses of the cases, i. e., cases with no distinct connection with the sentence. See Acts 7:40, ὁ γὰρ Μωυσῆς οὗτος. It is used in exclamations as in Matt. 3:17. So in Rom. 7:24, ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος. The use of the nominative form as vocative is really vocative and is treated under that case.

4. *The vocative.*

(a) This is the case of address (πτῶσις κλητική) and it is justified in usage, though strictly it is not a case so far as the form goes. In the Sanskrit "the vocative is not considered and named by the native grammarians as a case like the rest" (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 89). It is not distinguished from the nominative save in the singular and not always there. When it is so distinguished in the Sanskrit, it is either the mere stem or the accent is changed. Besides, the vocative is not an inherent part of the sentence; and yet, though without case endings, it has to be treated as a case for practical syntactical purposes.

(b) The vocative is used by itself as Πάτερ (John 17:1) or with ὦ as in Rom. 2:1, ὦ ἄνθρωπε. Thus in the plural ὦ ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι (Acts 18:14) or ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (Acts 17:22), just as in the older Greek.

(c) But the distinctive forms (merely the root) πάτερ and θύγατερ

are not always used in the vocative, the nominative forms appearing also as Πατήρ (John 17:24) and θυγάτηρ (Mark 5:34). We even have Πατὴρ δίκαιε in John 17:25. Note ὦ πλήρης, not πλῆρες, in Acts 13:10. The nominative form is used in apposition to the vocative form as in the Sanskrit and Homer. Thus ὦ ἄνθρωπε, πᾶς ὁ κρίνων, Rom. 2:1.

(d) The article with the nominative form, as above, is very common in the New Testament, though it is not unknown to the older Greek. It is the rule in address in the Hebrew and Aramaic (cf. ἀββά ὁ πατήρ, Mk. 14:36) and some of the examples are direct translations of the Aramaic as Mark 14:36 (above) and τὸ κοράσιον (ταλειθά) in Mark 5:41. But this is by no means always the case, for see τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον (Luke 12:32), *you* little flock. In Matt. 11:26 ὁ πατήρ is the practical equivalent of πάτερ in the preceding verse (Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 76).

(e) These must be called vocatives though they have the form of the nominative. So θεός in the New Testament, as in the older Greek, is the nominative form always save in one quotation from the Septuagint (Matt. 27:46). We thus have κύριε ὁ θεός in Rev. 15:3. It is not surprising therefore to find Thomas saying in direct address to Jesus, not exclamation, Ὁ κύριος μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (John 20:28). The form is nominative, but the case is vocative.

5. *The accusative.*

(a) The name is not very clear (πτῶσις αἰτιατική). It is more probably derived from αἰτία in the sense of cause, rather than of accusation. Priscian calls it *casus causativus*. It is then by name the causative case, though that is again very vague. "Accuse" in old English meant to betray or show, but the showing case would not distinguish it from the other oblique cases.

(b) However, it is the oldest case and the other oblique cases are variations or after developments. The accusative is the normal oblique case for a noun unless there is some reason for it to be used in some other case. The presumption then is in favor of the use of the accusative. Even the oldest form of ἐγώ is ἐγών (cf. Sanskrit *aham*). The accusative is used with verbs, substantives, and adjectives.

(c) The root idea of the accusative is extension whether of thought or the result of verbal action. In a general way it answers the question "How far?" (Giles, *Comparative Philology*, p. 303). The relation of the noun to the verb or other noun as shown by the accusative is very indefinite. The precise nature of the relation is determined by the character of the verb and the noun. It is not known what the ending *m(ν)* comes from. Some scholars consider it allied to Sanskrit *mā*, Greek με, others think it merely a local termination.

(d) The truth seems to be that originally the accusative was used very loosely even after the other oblique cases arose, when one did not wish to differentiate sharply, so that even a point of space or of time could be expressed by the accusative in Sanskrit and even in the N. T., as ὥραν ἐνάτην (some MSS. in Acts 10:3), ὥραν ἑβδόμην (John 4:52), ποίαν ὥραν ἥξω (Rev. 3:3).

(e) In fact in the vernacular Greek the accusative retains its old frequency as the normal case with verbs where the written style uses other cases (Mullach, *Grammatik der Griechischen Vulgarsprache*, S. 328-333), rather than locative, instrumental, dative, and even genitive and ablative. The same thing is observable in the old poets. Pindar, for example, has "a multiplicity of accusatives" (Giles). In the modern Greek the accusative has regained its old frequency to the corresponding disuse of the other cases. "When a fine sense for language is failing, it is natural to use the direct accusative to express *any* object which verbal action affects, and so to efface the difference between 'transitive' and 'intransitive' verbs" (Jebb, in Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook to Modern Greek*, p. 307). Hence many verbs that were intransitive in the written style are transitive in the vernacular as seen in the New Testament, papyri, and modern Greek. The use of the other oblique cases served to make fine distinctions. When these distinctions were not sharply perceived, the use of the cases faded. The accusative then has made a circle. In the beginning it was the only case. It is again the normal case in modern Greek. So in the New Testament we have οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον (1 Cor. 7:31) instead of the instrumental τῷ κόσμῳ (cf. *utor* in Latin). The accusative with

χρῆσθαι is found in Cretan inscriptions and in late Greek. In Acts 27:22 Luke has παραινῶ ὑμᾶς and not the dative ὑμῖν. So in Rev. 2:14 we have ἐδίδασκεν τῷ βαλάκ (dative) as in some late writers, perhaps partly influenced by Hebrew.

(f) But in general we can easily see the root idea of the accusative. For convenience we may analyze the examples and explain them in the light of the root idea and the history.

(g) Extension naturally found first expression with verbs of motion. In Sanskrit "it stands especially as the goal of motion, with verbs of going, bringing, sending, and the like" (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 92). In Homer this use is common with verbs which imply reaching a point and in the poets the idiom continued to be frequent both as to place and persons. In English we say, go home, where home is accusative. This original use of the accusative is not preserved in the New Testament, but in Matt. 4:15 ὁδὸν θαλάσσης is closely related to it, by way of the sea.

(h) Extension of space is clearly expressed by the accusative and is a normal development from verbs of motion. So in John 6:19 we have the idiom common to all Greek, ἐληλακότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἴκοσι πέντε ἢ τριάκοντα. This sometimes is in the Sanskrit, Latin, Greek, English, etc.

(i) Duration of time is distinctly conveyed by the root idea of the accusative. This idiom is a common one in the Indo-germanic languages. Τί ὧδε ἑστήκατε ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀργοί; (Matt. 20:6). So in Luke 15:29 we have τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι. Compare ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν (Matt. 20:2). But note above the old use of the accusative where duration cannot be accented (John 4:52).

(j) With verbs that are transitive the accusative is the natural case for the expression of the extension of the action of the verb to an external object. Not all verbs in Greek are transitive, and the same verb is not always transitive as ἔμενον ἡμᾶς (Acts 20:5), but ἔμενεν παρ' αὐτοῖς (Acts 18:3). Besides it is not a question whether the verb is transitive in Sanskrit or in English, but in Greek, as μὴ ὀμνύετε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν (James 5:12). So τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν (John 8:27). The Greek could look at ὄμνυμι as transitive in the sense of swearing by and λέγω in the sense of speaking

about. Moreover, when the verb is transitive, it does not have to use the accusative, if some other case is considered more in harmony with the idea to be expressed. So ἐπιλανθάνομαι is used with the accusative in Phil. 3:13 τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω, but with the genitive in Heb. 13:2 φιλοξενίας. Sometimes the difference is quite marked as with ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς (Acts 9:7) and τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν (Acts 22:9). Once more, verbal phrases may be looked at as transitive, when the verb itself is intransitive, as Ἄρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς (Acts 23:5), and ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν (Luke 6:26). But the great bulk of the accusatives with transitive verbs call for no remark as ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς (Matt. 4:21), ἐκτήσατο χωρίον (Acts 1:18).

(k) Some verbs may use an accusative of the inner object or content (Delbrueck), or of the outer objective result. The action of the verb expresses itself in a word of the same root as ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν (Mark 4:41), φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς (Luke 2:8), the so-called cognate accusative. Here again the idea of extension is obvious and vital. Sometimes the word is not identical in root, but only similar in sense as ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν (Luke 1:73). In this last example as in others the relative is used thus as ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με (Jo. 17:26). The accusative naturally expresses the objective result in the same way as ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν (1 John 5:16), ὃ ἀπέθανεν . . . . ὃ δὲ ζῇ (Rom. 6:10).

(l) Some verbs, moreover, can be used with two accusatives or, if time or space be considered, with three. This double accusative is very common in the Sanskrit. The second accusative may be simply in apposition with the first as οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, a predicate accusative. But εἰς is often used with this predicate accusative as εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον (Matt. 21:46). One accusative may be of the person and the other of the thing as ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (John 14:26), ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον (Matt. 7:9), τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν (Matt. 27:22), ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον ἕνα (Matt. 21:24), ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν πορφύραν (Mark 15:17), ὁρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν (Mark 5:7), ἔχρισέ σε . . . . ἔλαιον (Heb. 1:9). With αἰτέω the person could be put in the ablative. So παρὰ and ablative in Acts 3:2, and ἀφαιρεῖται ἀπ' ἐμοῦ (Luke 16:3). With ἐνδιδύσκω the garment could be put in the locative or the instrumental. Compare

περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς (Rev. 3:5). With χρίω the instrumental case could be used as in Acts 10:38 (πνεύματι ἁγίῳ). So the double accusative is sometimes optional. The accusative of the thing may be cognate as in Eph. 2:4 above or causative as in Mark 9:41 ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος. Sometimes the adjective alone expresses one of the accusatives as ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει (Gal. 5:2).

(m) Some verbs use the accusative even in the passive. It is a mistake to associate the accusative in one's mind simply with the active voice. Many verbs are intransitive in the active voice, while the middle voice is just as likely to be transitive as the active, and indeed the passive voice may also be transitive, though in the nature of the case this is not so frequent as with the other voices. But it is to be remembered that the passive is an after development and may retain some of the force of the early form. Certainly the passive form gradually encroached on the middle and sometimes loses its passive idea (passive deponents). Some of these passive deponents are transitive and are used with the accusative, as μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς (Matt. 10:26). But in Matt. 10:28 note ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων. The present middle φοβεῖσθε is intransitive in Matt. 10:31 and transitive in Matt. 10:28. See also ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου (Matt. 21:37), ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με (Mark 8:38), ψυχὴν ζημιωθῇ (Matt. 16:26). Sanskrit had no proper passive voice, but in Greek, Latin, and English some verbs that had two accusatives retain the accusative of the thing in the passive. This is natural, for the other alternatives would be a predicate nominative (as happens with verbs of calling, naming, making. for example, Heb. 5:10) or another oblique case. With the passive of διδάσκω the accusative is the only recourse in Greek, Latin, and English, as ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε (2 Thess. 2:15), but with verbs like περιβάλλω either the accusative is possible (as usually), περιβεβλημένους στολὰς λευκάς (Rev. 7:9), or the locative, περιβεβλημένους ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς (Rev. 3:4). See also δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας . . . . καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο (John 11:44), δαρήσεται ὀλίγας (Luke 12:47), ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι (Mark 10:38), οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι (1 Cor. 9:17), διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν (1 Tim. 6:5), where there was only one accusative in the active or middle, that of the thing, the person

being in the dative. The Greek has more liberty than the Latin and can turn this dative into the nominative verbal subject and retain the accusative of the thing as in case of two accusatives. Indeed by analogy the Greek can greatly extend this construction as see πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης (Phil. 1:11), τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα (2 Cor. 3:18), and even τὴν ἄλυσιν περίκειμαι (Acts 28:20) where the passive of the verb περιτίθημι is evidently in accordance with ancient usage. There is also one example of the accusative with the verbal in τέον in Luke 5:38, οἶνον νέον . . . βλητέον.

(n) Then again the accusative as the case of extension may be the case of substantives or adjectives apart from any verb, as ὃν τρόπον (Matt. 23:37), τὸν ἀριθμόν (John 6:10), τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Heb. 2:17). In the Sanskrit "the neuter accusative of innumerable adjectives, simple or compound, is used adverbially" (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 93). The adverb is merely a word in a fixed case. The Greek used a multitude of such accusatives as adverbs not only in the neuter (singular and plural), but in the masculine and the feminine singular of substantives, and the feminine singular of adjectives. So πολὺ σπουδαιότερον (2 Cor. 8:22), πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν (Rom. 16.6), τὴν ἀρχήν (John 8:25), δωρεάν (Matt. 10:8). This use of the accusative is in perfect harmony with the idea of the case.

(o) The accusative is used with the infinitive, not merely as object, but in a general way as the person connected with the action. The infinitive, like the participle, cannot have a subject, but it can indicate the person who has to do with the action, when not otherwise clear, by the accusative. So πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα (Heb. 5:12), ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν (Luke 2:27). This use of the accusative is found also in Latin and Anglo-Saxon and is in thorough accord with the idea of the case. The action stated in the infinitive holds good as far as the person mentioned is concerned.

(p) There remains still the accusative absolute. The grammars generally mean by this a participle and substantive in the accusative. But even here the accusative is not out of line with its own

idea, though the connection with the sentence is not very close. In 1 Cor. 16:6 τυχόν is an example of the neuter accusative participle so used. There is a still larger connection of thought. An example may probably be found in γνώστην ὄντα σε (Acts 26:3), unless an anacoluthon is allowed. Even then the fact remains and the accusative is not difficult of explanation. In Rom. 8:3 τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου may be a nominative absolute, but is just as naturally the accusative. In Rom. 12:18 the parenthetic phrase τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν is accusative.

(q) The accusative is frequently used with prepositions which merely accent the idea of extension in a more specialized way. The prepositions do not then properly govern the case, but are rather fuller expressions of the precise idea of the case, being themselves properly adverbs. Thus we have ἀνὰ μέσον (Mark 7:31), διὰ τὸν φόβον (John 7:13), εἰς τὴν πόλιν (Matt. 26:18), ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (Matt. 15:35), κατὰ τὸν νόμον (Luke 2:22), μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς (Luke 2:46), παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν (Matt. 20:30), περὶ αὐτόν (Matt. 8:18), πρὸς αὐτόν (Matt. 3:5), ὑπὲρ δοῦλον (Philemon 16), ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον (Matt. 5:15).

6. *The genitive.*

(a) It is no longer open to dispute that in Greek two cases, the genitive and the ablative, are found with the same ending. Moulton properly calls Winer's definition of the genitive as "unquestionably the *whence-case*" "an utterly unjustifiable procedure." It is hopeless to try to find the explanation of the genitive in the ablative as Kuehner and Crosby did or the ablative in the genitive as Madvig attempted. Comparative grammar has settled this matter. The two cases happen in Greek to have the same form, but do not have the same idea, though examples occur that can be explained either as genitive or ablative.

(b) The genitive has the wrong name. It is not *casus genitivus* or πτῶσις γεννητική, but rather πτῶσις γενική as the Stoic grammarians called it. It is, then, the case of γένος, genus, kind, species, in a word the specifying case. It is thus a descriptive case and is in function adjectival, though it is not adjectival in origin. See ἡμέρα παρασκευῆς (Luke 23:54). It is a mistake to explain the ending ος or οιο as derived from the adjectival suffix, though it is

not known what the origin of the genitive ending is. It may be pronominal.

(c) The use of the genitive was greatly extended in the later Sanskrit, and in the modern Greek it has maintained itself far better than the dative. The form has survived better in the Indo-European languages than that of any of the other cases. In fact in the modern Greek the form shares with the accusative the result of the loss of the dative. We have such constructions as τοῦ τὸ εἶπα, I told him so. But in the New Testament the genitive form is not so used. The real genitive always tells the kind or species. It is this and no other.

(d) The resultant idea will naturally greatly vary according as this root conception is applied to different words and different contexts. It must never be forgotten that the varying resultant idea does not involve a change in the root idea of the case. The error must not be made of mistaking the translation of this resultant idea for the philosophical or historical explanation of the case itself. Μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος (Matt. 1:12) is translated removal to Babylon, but surely the genitive does not mean "to." It is difficult to make a satisfactory grouping of a case with so many possible combinations in detail, and the simplest analysis is the best. The true idea of the case will be found everywhere.

(e) The use of the genitive with substantives is uniform in essence, but varied in application.

(1) The local use of the genitive is the most objective and probably the earliest as with most of the cases. The local adverbs αὐτοῦ, οὗ, ὅπου, ποῦ, πανταχοῦ, ὁμοῦ are all probably in the genitive case, though it is possible that they are short forms of the locative form -οθι. In Homer the genitive is thus used freely, especially with negatives as οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν. So in the New Testament we have οὐ μόνον Ἐφέσου ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος πείσας μετέστησεν ἱκανὸν ὄχλον (Acts 19:26). This usage survived in the vernacular and the poets. The poets are often the best source for actual usage of the people. Compare the Latin *Romae, humi* (really locative forms) and the Greek idiom ποῦ γῆς. It is not surprising therefore to find the genitive used with such local prep-

ositions (adverbs) as ἐπί, περί, μετά, ἐντός, πλησίον, ἕνεκεν, ἐναντιόν. Homer can say λούεσθαι ποταμοῖο, to bathe in a river, and Luke can use ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος (16:24), where ὕδατος emphasizes clearly the *kind* of material in which he was to dip his finger. The genitive is not only used with the idea of rest, but even where the conception of motion is involved, though the genitive does not, like the accusative, accent extension, but genus. In Matt. 1:11 and 12 μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος is thus properly a Babylon removal. In itself it could be a removal to Babylon or from Babylon and the solution we must seek elsewhere than in this phrase. The same thing holds true in regard to ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων (John 7:35) and ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν (Matt. 10:5). It is in fact the dispersion of the Jews among the Greeks and the way to the Gentiles. Note also ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν (Luke 5:19), and ἐκείνης (Luke 19:4).

(2) The root idea of the genitive is very plain in expressions of time, the genitive of selection, this rather than some other time. In Luke 18:7 ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός do not emphasize the wholeness of either day or night as in Luke 2:37 (νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν), but rather that both day and night are included. So also μέσης νυκτός (Matt. 25:6). See also τὸ λοιπόν (Heb. 10:13) and τοῦ λοιποῦ (Gal. 6:17). In Matt. 24:20 the distinction is seen between the genitive χειμῶνος as the case of genus and the locative σαββάτῳ expressing a point of time. It is not strange to see δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου (Luke 18:12) and ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ (Heb. 9:7). In the New Testament, however, prepositions occur very often with expressions of time with either the accusative, genitive, or locative case, as εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη (Luke 12:19), δι' ἡμερῶν (Mark 2:1), ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ (John 2:23).

(3) In the Sanskrit there are hardly any possessive adjectives. Possession is the most obvious and the most usual use of the genitive case, as πατάξας τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀφεῖλον αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον (Matt. 26:51). It is the high priest's servant, not that of another, and it is the servant's ear, not another's. Sometimes the relationship is not clearly defined, but is assumed as plain. So Μαρία Ἰακώβου (Luke 24:10) is James's Mary, which might be his mother, wife, or daughter. We learn from elsewhere that it is his mother.

Often the genitive is used simply with the article, where the context explains, as οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal. 5:24), especially the neuter article as τὰ Καίσαρος (Mark 12:17).

(4) Indeed the genitive may express identity (apposition) as πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας (2 Pet. 2:6), ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους (2 Cor. 5:1). The genitive characterizes the substantive as τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. 6:6), ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας (Luke 16:8), though it must not be regarded as identical with the adjective (see ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς, Rom. 6:4), and even expressions like υἱοὶ φωτός (1 Thess. 5:5) are shown by the papyri not to be mere Hebraisms, but in accord with general Greek idiom.

(5) It is not alone quality that can be expressed by the genitive, but also a partitive sense (possibly ablative), as τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως (Rev. 11:13), and sometimes such a genitive is found alone with no noun as the subject of the verb as συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν (Acts 21:16). The genitive naturally expresses price as δηναρίου (Rev. 6:6).

(6) The genitive may be either subjective as ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς (2 Cor. 5:14) where it is Christ's love for Paul that constrains him, or objective as ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ (Mark 11:22) or ἐπὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενοῦς (Acts 4:9) when the good deed is done to the man, not by him. In ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία (Matt. 12:31) we have a good instance of the objective genitive. There is nothing in the genitive itself to determine when the usage is subjective or objective. In itself it is neither. That is a matter for the context.

(7) In a word the genitive is the *general* or genus case and the precise specifying lies in the word, not the case. Βάπτισμα μετανοίας (Mark 1:4) is therefore repentance baptism; what the precise relation is between the two is not set forth by the case. In τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός (Matt. 5:22) Gehenna is described as characterized by fire.

(8) Most frequently the genitive comes after the limiting word as in Matt. 5:22 above, but observe Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος (Acts 14:1) and ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία (Matt. 12:31).

(9) Two and even three genitives can be used together, as τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 4:4).

(f) The use of the genitive with adjectives is naturally more or less parallel to that with substantives. So ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας (Matt. 3:8), πλήρης χάριτος (John 1:14) though Latin here has the ablative (or is it instrumental?) with *plenus*, συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος (Rom. 8:29), ἔνοχος αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος (Mark 3:29), ἔννομος Χριστοῦ (1 Cor. 9:21), and even τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων (1 Pet. 5:9). Occasionally the participle is so used as τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου (Luke 2:27).

(g) Adverbs and hence prepositions may be used with the genitive when the meaning of the adverb is in accord with the idea of the case. So ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων (Rom. 16:2), and prepositions like μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (Matt. 23:35), ἐγγὺς τῆς Λύδδας (Acts 9:38), πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου (John 4:5), ἔσω ἡμῶν (2 Cor. 4:16), ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (Luke 17:21), μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (Matt. 28:15), ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Matt. 1:17), ἄχρι Πάφου (Acts 13:6), ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ (Matt. 10:18), ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Col. 1:16), μεθ' ἡμῶν (Matt. 1:23), κατ' ἐμοῦ (Luke 11:23), περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Acts 28:23), ἀντὶ πολλῶν (Matt. 20:28), διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (Matt. 1:22).

(h) The genitive is very common with verbs, where the idea of species is accented. With verbs the genitive is this and no other, while the accusative with verbs is this and no more (Broadus).

(1) What is called the predicate genitive is a very obvious use of the case as πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν (1 Cor. 3:21).

(2) Some verbs lend themselves more readily to the idea of the genitive, though very few verbs can be said always to require the genitive rather than the accusative. See previous discussion of the accusative. So some verbs of sensation as πάντα μου μέμνησθε (1 Cor. 11:2) like vernacular English "remember of" μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ (Luke 17:32), but μνημονεύετε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους (Matt. 16:9); ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν (Heb. 6:10), but τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος (Phil. 3:13); αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε (Mark 9:7), but ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμόν (Luke 1:41); γεύσεταί μου τοῦ δείπνου (Luke 14:24), but ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὕδωρ (John 2:9); ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην (Philemon 20), ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς (Acts 9:1); κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους (Heb. 12:20); καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ (1 Tim. 3:1), but ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν (Matt. 5:28); ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται (1 Tim. 3:1), γέμουσιν ὀστέων (Matt. 23:27), but γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας (Rev. 17:3).

(3) Another group of verbs that often use the genitive exhibit one's concern for, or estimate of, a matter. These verbs do not differ greatly from the preceding list, as *ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ* (Luke 10:34); *μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου* (Heb. 12:5); *τῶν ἰδίων οὐ προνοεῖ* (1 Tim. 5:8); *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο* (Rom. 8:32); *πραθῆναι πολλοῦ* (Matt. 26:9); *ὠνήσατο τιμῆς ἀργυρίου* (Acts 7:16); *ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως* (Acts 19:40); *διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν* (1 Tim. 5:17).

(4) There is still another group of verbs of a more objective character as *οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν* (Mark 10:42); *βασιλεύει τῆς Ἰουδαίας* (Matt. 2:22); *τῆς ὑμῶν ἐξουσίας μετέχουσιν* (1 Cor. 9:12); *κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος* (Heb. 2:14), but *μὴ κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις* (1 Tim. 5:22); *ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ* (Matt. 14:31); *ἐκράτησε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς* (Matt. 9:25), but *κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάνην* (Matt. 14:3); *πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός* (Acts 3:7); *τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται* (Luke 16:13). Some verbs evidently use the genitive as a result of the change of idea wrought in the verb by the preposition *κατά* used in composition, as *αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας* (Heb. 12:2), *σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν* (Matt. 27:13), *κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ* (Matt. 9:24).

(5) It is not possible to decide positively whether what is called the genitive absolute is genitive or ablative. In Sanskrit the instrumental (associative) is sometimes so used and the locative often, while in Anglo-Saxon the dative is the case for absolute clauses with a participle. This is especially true of Wycliff, but this dative form is sometimes instrumental. In Latin the case so used is the ablative as generally considered, but here again the instrumental and the ablative have the same form. Mullach (*Grammatik*, p. 357) says that in Greek the genitive absolute belongs to the higher style, and was not used much in the vernacular. In the modern Greek vernacular (Jebb) this idiom has practically disappeared and conjunctions and finite verbs are used instead. But in the papyri this construction is used with great frequency and freedom. In the New Testament the usage is hardly so common and occurs chiefly in the historical books. Note *ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν* (Matt. 2:13). Sometimes, as in the earlier Greek, the genitive absolute is used where the participle might have been made to agree with a substantive or pronoun in the sentence, as

ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος ἐφάνη αὐτῷ (Matt. 1:20), and even when it is the subject of the principal verb as μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας . . . . εὑρέθη (Matt. 1:18). If this construction is really the genitive, and not ablative, the genitive of the substantive or pronoun has its usual explanation and the participle is an adjective in agreement.

7. *The ablative.* The remaining uses of the genitive form, not genitive in idea, are ablative. The old ablative ending *t* or *d*, seen in some words, Latin inscriptions like *domod*, Greek ὡς(τ), πῶς(τ), οὐρανόθεν, Umbrian *tu* (out of), Anglo-Saxon *ût* (out of), is held by some to be demonstrative like Sanskrit *ta*. But, whatever may be true as to the origin of the original ending, the idea of the case is clear. It is the case of origin or separation, *casus ablativus* as Julius Caesar called it, πτῶσις ἀφαιρετική. This is the "whence" case of Winer. Like the genitive, the ablative is used possibly with substantives, certainly with adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and verbs.

(a) Homer could say ὀλίγη ἀνάπαυσις πολέμοιο, short is the rest from war. But, as in Latin the ablative disappears from use with substantives, so in Greek, unless indeed some examples of the so-called partitive genitive may not more properly be considered ablative, as ἓν τούτων (Matt. 6:29). This is rendered more probable by the frequent use of ἀπό or ἐξ with the ablative in similar examples, as τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο (Matt. 27:21), τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Luke 12:25). It is possible to think of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (Rom. 1:17) as ablative, righteousness from God, but it is more likely the genitive, God's kind of righteousness.

(b) But certainly the ablative occurs in the New Testament with some adjectives. It is common enough in the earlier Greek as in Plato ἐπιστήμης κενός, ἐλεύθερος αἰδοῦς. So ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν (Eph. 2:12), ἀπείραστος κακῶν (James 1:13), and other verbal adjectives like διδακτοὶ θεοῦ (John 6:45), διδακτοῖς πνεύματος (1 Cor. 2:13); γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν (Matt. 11:11), κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rom. 1:6), and participles also as εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός (Matt. 25:34). Moreover, the ablative may be used after the comparative form of the adjective, μείζων τοῦ κυρίου (John 13:16), μικρότερος πάντων

(Mark 4:31), and also after the superlative as πρῶτός μου (John 1:15).

(c) The ablative is very common in the New Testament with adverbs and so with prepositions. The growth of prepositions in addition to the mere case is especially noticeable with the ablative. So χωρὶς παραβολῆς (Matt. 13:34), ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ (1 Peter 4:9), ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος (1 Cor. 6:18), ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας (Matt. 10:14), ἄτερ ὄχλου (Luke 22:6), ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως (Rev. 14:20), πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου (Acts 27:22); possibly also ὀπίσω μου (Matt. 3:11), ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Matt. 5:16), πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Matt. 4:25), ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν (Mark 6:11); so also ἀπὸ σοῦ (Matt. 5:29), ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος (Mark 1:10), παρ' αὐτῶν (Matt. 2:4), ὑπὸ πάντων (Acts 22:12), ὑπὲρ πάντων (2 Cor. 5:15), πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα (John 11:55), πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας (Acts 27:34). The ablative idea of comparison (separation) is in several of these prepositions. A number of adverbs are themselves in the ablative as οὕτως, πῶς, ἄνω, etc.

(d) The ablative occurs rather often with verbs (though not so frequently as the accusative, genitive, or dative), where the idea of separation or origin is dominant. So ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται (2 Peter 1:20), ὧν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες (1 Tim. 1:6), ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ βουλήματος (Acts 27:43), ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου (Acts 1:4), ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι (Luke 24:16), ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. 3:23), λείπεται σοφίας (James 1:5), ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ (Luke 5:12), δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα (Rev. 2:17) where the part is contrasted with the whole (compare the ablative in ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω, 1 Cor. 11:28, and ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων, Matt. 15:27), οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (2 Peter 3:9); so also with a number of compound verbs as ἀφίστατο τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Luke 2:37), ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως (Eph. 3:19), ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς (Eph. 4:18), ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως (1 Tim. 4:1), ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας (1 Tim. 6:5), διαφέρετε αὐτῶν (Matt. 6:26). Cf. also τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε (Gal. 5:4). In examples like Heb. 12:11, οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης, and Acts 20:3, ἐγένετο γνώμης, we probably have the ablative. See ἐπιλύσεως in 2 Peter 1:20.

8. *The locative.* In Greek most of the dative and instrumental examples are locative in form. Bopp considered the locative end-

ing *i* to be the root of the old demonstrative pronoun. But in actual Greek usage locative forms are used also as instrumental and dative, while dative forms are used freely as locative and instrumental (Giles, *Comparative Philology*, p. 330). The case is very common in the Sanskrit with its distinctive ending, while in Latin these three cases and the ablative have the same form save that in the singular the dative sometimes has a separate ending. In Gothic the three cases have no distinction in form, but in Anglo-Saxon the instrumental and the dative have separate endings and some locatives occur as *here*, *there*, *where*. See Skeat and March. The Latin uses the locative case freely as *humi*, *Romae* (*ai*), *Corinthi*. In Homer the locative is far more common than in the later Greek, while in the modern Greek vernacular the locative along with the dative disappears save with a few prepositions. The significance of the locative is very simple. In Sanskrit Whitney calls it the *in* case, and so it is in Greek. It indicates a point within limits and corresponds in idea with the English *in*, *on*, *among*, *at*, *by*, the resultant conception varying according to the meaning of the words and the context. In every instance it is not hard to see the simple root idea of the case, a point with limits set by the word and context.

(a) The locative is used thus with substantives and verbs to express location in space. In Homer it is very common to have the simple locative with names of towns, countries, crowds, etc. But in the New Testament, as usually in the Attic prose, a preposition is nearly always so used with the locative as ἐν Ἀθήναις (1 Thess. 3:1). However observe λῃσταῖς περιέπεσεν, (Luke 10:30). In Jas. 2:25 we have ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα, and with several verbs expressing the idea of going the locative is used as πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν (Acts 14:16), στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι (Rom. 4:12). But the old locative with expressions of place is preserved in the adverb χαμαί (John 18:6), though οἴκοι, αὐτόθι, ποί no longer appear in the New Testament. But κύκλῳ (Mark 3:34) occurs several times. And the locative is still used with outward objects as τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον (John 21:8), whereas in Matt. 14:13 we read ἐν πλοίῳ; and in Luke 3:16 we have ὕδατι βαπτίζω, while in Matt. 3:11 the text is βαπτίζω

ἐν ὕδατι, as in Mark 1:8; Acts 1:5; 11:16 the locative ὕδατι appears without ἐν. See also the locative in Eph. 5:26, καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος; John 19:2, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ; Acts 14:8, ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν; and 1 Cor. 9:13, τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύοντες.

(b) The locative without a preposition is freely used with many expressions of time as in Sanskrit, Latin, Anglo-Saxon. Here, of course, the time is viewed as a point, not duration (accusative), nor distinction (genitive). Observe difference between τὸ σάββατον and τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων in Luke 24:1. So the locative occurs with expressions like τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Matt. 20:19), ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί (Luke 12:20), αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (Luke 2:38), τετάρτῃ φυλακῇ (Matt. 14:25), τῷ σαββάτῳ (Luke 6:9), τοῖς σάββασιν (Matt. 12:1), τῇ ἑορτῇ (Luke 2:41), ἑτέραις γενεαῖς (Eph. 3:5), τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ (Mark 6:21). With most of the phrases mentioned above ἐν is also used and other expressions of time always use ἐν. The ἐν adds little, if anything, in point of fact to the true idea of the locative case, but it constantly increases in use. The locative appears in some temporal adverbs as πέρυσι (2 Cor. 8:10), ἀεί (2 Cor. 6:10), πάλαι (2 Cor. 12:19). But Brugmann (*Gr. Gr.*, S. 252) considers πάλαι and χαμαί dative forms.

(c) The locative is naturally common with many figurative expressions without ἐν as well as with ἐν. The root idea of the case meets every demand for the explanation of all these examples as οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι (Matt. 5:3), τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν (Acts 21:21), σχήματι εὑρεθείς (Phil. 2:8), τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε (1 Cor. 14:20), πορευομένη τῷ φόβῳ (Acts 9:31), βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (Mark 1:8), ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις (James 1:2), χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν (Col. 2:14), καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ (Matt. 5:8).

(d) The locative is not used in the Greek New Testament with as many prepositions as in Homer. Originally nearly all the prepositions used the locative, but this case gradually disappeared with most of these prepositional adverbs. So in the New Testament ἀμφί, μετά, ὑπό, ἀνά, περί no longer use the locative, but, as in Homer (Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 101), so in the New Testament the locative is often used after verbs compounded with them as well as with ἐν, παρά, ἐπί. See examples above. Here as always

the prepositions do not govern the locative, but "stand to it in the relation of adverbial elements strengthening and directing its meaning" (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 103). A number of prepositions like ἀμφί, ἐν (ἐνί), ἐπί, περί, πρός (προτί), are themselves in the locative case. There are only four prepositions that use the locative in the New Testament. They are ἐν, ἐπί, παρά, πρός. As examples see ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ (Matt. 3:6), ἐπὶ θύραις (Matt. 24:33), παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (John 19:25), πρὸς τῷ μνημείῳ (John 20:11).

(e) What is called the pregnant construction of the locative or the accusative appears in the New Testament in connection with ἐν and εἰς. In the older Greek the cases without prepositions were so used. In such instances either the accusative is used with a verb of rest as very often with εἰς and παρά (so ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν in Mark 13:16 and στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ in Luke 7:38) or the locative is used with a verb of motion as ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ (Matt. 26:23) where Mark (14:20) has εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον. It is a difference of conception in harmony with each case. The accusative suggests extension and the locative emphasizes location. The accusative is so used more frequently than the locative. Εἰς and ἐν were originally the same and εἰς constantly encroaches on ἐν.

9. *The instrumental case.* The history of this case is not as clear as that of the others. It is possible that there are here two cases combined, an old associative case with the ending *a* as in ἅμα, τάχα, and the true instrumental case with the ending *bhi* for singular and *bhis* for plural. Φι does occur in Homer for the singular as θεόφι and φιν for the plural as θεόφιν, but in Homer these endings are used not only for the instrumental, but also for the locative, the ablative, and possibly the dative also (Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, S. 239). Moreover in the Sanskrit singular *a* is the ending and in the plural *bhis*. It is possible therefore that we have only the one case, which has developed the instrumental idea from that of association. The two conceptions are close kin and it is not hard for association to develop into agent or instrument. Our English *with* is a pertinent example which originally had merely

the idea of association (*by, near*), but has developed into that of agency. And the same thing is true of *by*. It is proper therefore to treat it as one case with the original significance of mere association and a later idea of instrumental association. It was once used with expressions of place but it no longer so appears in the New Testament, unless ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα (James 2:25) be so taken (locative most probably). Even ὅπῃ and πῇ are not used in the New Testament. But in Westcott and Hort's text for Acts 21:28 we do have πανταχῇ.

(a) The instrumental does occur in the N. T. in expressions of time where a considerable period of time is presented. The acc. might here be used, but the instr. is an old Indo-germanic usage. So in John 2:20 we have τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη. Cf. also Acts 13:20 where we have ὡς ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα, for the whole period. See Luke 8:29 πολλοῖς χρόνοις, Acts 8:11 ἱκανῷ χρόνῳ (cf. Luke 8:27), Rom. 16:25 χρόνοις αἰωνίοις.

(b) The idea of association or accompaniment occurs in a number of examples, as ὡμίλει αὐτῷ (Acts 24:26), ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις (2 Cor. 6:14), μεμιγμένην πυρί (Rev. 15:2), κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν (1 Peter 4:13), ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ (Mark 1:18), ἐκολλήθη ἑνὶ (Luke 15:15), συνείπετο δὲ αὐτῷ (Acts 20:4), μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀνομίᾳ (2 Cor. 6:14). Prepositions and other cases are sometimes used with some of these verbs, but these are clear examples of the associative instrumental. Cf. εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ (Jo. 12:13).

(c) Allied to the above usage is the instrumental with words of likeness. The correspondence is a figurative association, as ὅμοιος αὐτῷ (John 9:9), ἴσους ἡμῖν (Matt. 20:12), παρομοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις (Matt. 23:27), τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ (1 Cor. 11:5), ἔοικεν κλύδωνι θαλάσσης (James 1:6).

(d) This idea of association is very common with expressions of manner, where the idea is going on towards means or instrument. So we explain εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω (1 Cor. 10:30), παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ (Phil. 1:18), ἀκαταλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ (1 Cor. 11:5), τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς (Eph. 2:3), Κύπριος τῷ γένει (Acts 4:36), and even προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (James 5:17) and θανάτῳ τελευτάτω (Matt. 15:4) for, though answering to the Hebrew infini-

tive absolute, this construction is common in Homer. A number of adverbs in the instrumental case illustrate this usage as πανοικεί (Acts 16:34), τάχα (Rom. 5:7), πανπληθεί (Luke 23:18), πάντῃ (Acts 24:3), κρυφῇ (Eph. 5:12), ἰδίᾳ (1 Cor. 12:11), δημοσίᾳ (Acts 16:37), ἅμα (Acts 24:26), and the preposition μετά and the conjunction ἵνα.

(e) The instrumental case is also used to express the idea of cause or ground. This conception likewise wavers between association and means. Thus we have τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται (Heb. 13:16), τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν (Rom. 11:20), μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει (1 Pet. 4:12), ἵνα μὴ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διώκωνται (Gal. 6:12).

(f) Means or instrument can thus be naturally expressed by this case. Donaldson (*New Cratylus*, p. 439) calls it the implementive case. The verb χράομαι obviously, like *utor* in Latin, has the instrumental case as πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα (2 Cor. 3:12). Other illustrations are συναπήχθη τῇ ὑποκρίσει (Gal. 2:13), ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ (Luke 7:38), ἀνεῖλεν δὲ Ἰάκωβον . . . . μαχαίρῃ (Acts 12:2), δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει (James 3:7), ἁλύσεσι δεδέσθαι (Mark 5:4), οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε, ... ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι (1 Pet. 1:18 f.), πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ (Rom. 1:29), χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι (Eph. 2:8), ᾧ τις ἥττηται (2 Peter 2:19); and probably also τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν (Rom. 8:24) and κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ (Matt. 3:12) though these could also be locative. The agent with passive verbs may also be expressed in the instrumental case as οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ (Luke 23:15), and probably κἀγὼ εὑρεθῶ ὑμῖν (2 Cor. 12:20), though this may possibly be a true dative (Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, S. 400).

(g) The instrumental case is used to express measure in comparative phrases. In English *the* is in the instrumental case in phrases like *the more, the less*, as is shown by the Anglo-Saxon *thȳ* (*thē*). The accusative gradually displaces the instrumental in Greek for this idea, yet it appears several times in Hebrews as in 10:25, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε. See also πολλῷ μᾶλλον (Mark 10:48).

(h) Only two prepositions use the instrumental in Greek, ἅμα

and σύν. In Latin *cum* is used with the instrumental and in Sanskrit *sam* (σύν). See ἅμα αὐτοῖς (Matt. 13:29) and σὺν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ πλῆθος (Luke 2:13). Verbs compounded with σύν take the instrumental very often as συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ (Col. 3:1), ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται (Luke 10:40), συνχαίρετέ μοι (Phil. 2:18). There are other ways of expressing many of the above ideas in Greek than by the instrumental case as prepositions grew into common use. For instance, cause or ground can be clearly conveyed by διά and the accusative, manner by ἐν and the locative, and even means or instrument by ἐν and the locative as ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ (Rev. 6:8). This last construction is like the Hebrew idiom, it is true, but it is also occasionally present in the older Greek and survives in the papyri. Greek, like other languages, and more than some, had flexibility and variety in the expression of the same idea.

10. *The dative.* This Greek case, according to Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, S. 226 f. coalesced in form with the locative and instrumental after they had lost distinction in endings. So then in Greek the union was first between the locative and instrumental. The case-endings of the three cases which thus united are partly locative (ι, ισι), partly dative (αι), and partly instrumental (α in adverbs and dialects, φι in Homer, and possibly -οις). Clearer traces of the difference in endings survive in Greek than in the ablative. In a few words both locative and dative forms occur in Greek (οἴκοι, οἴκῳ). In Latin the dative singular is often separate from locative, instrumental, and ablative. But in both Greek and Latin the function of these cases remains distinct after the forms are blended. In the modern Greek vernacular this form for all three vanishes. For the dative it was εἰς and the accusative or even the genitive form by itself. So in English the dative form has gone save with some pronouns like *him*, *me*, though the case is used either without any sign or usually with *to*, as *I gave John a book* or *I gave a book to John.* See in Wyclyf's Bible, "Believe ye to the gospel" (Mark 1:15). The idea of the dative (πτῶσις δοτική, *casus dativus*, the giving case) is very simple. It is the case of personal interest and accents one's personal advantage or disadvantage. It is chiefly used with persons

or things personified. It is thus a purely grammatical case (rein grammatisch) like the nominative and vocative, and therefore is not properly used with prepositions. So also it is not often used with expressions of place, for even ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ (Rev. 2:16) is not place, but person, though the verb is a verb of motion. In Heb. 12:18,22 place occurs with the dative. Cf. also Acts 9:3. The dative, like the other cases, has a variety of applications for its fundamental idea.

(a) It is thus naturally the indirect object of verbs as προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία (Mark 10:13), ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς (Mark 9:12), μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί (Matt. 7:6), ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν (Matt. 6:12), though the dative is not necessary in such examples as ἤνεγκον αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν (Mark 9:20), εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα (Luke 5:10).

(b) But the dative may be also the direct object of transitive verbs where the personal interest of the subject is emphasized. So we have ἠπειθήσατε τῷ θεῷ (Rom. 11:30), ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ (Acts 5:36), ἠπίστουν αὐτοῖς (Luke 24:11), θεῷ ἀρέσαι (Rom. 8:8), δουλεύω σοι (Luke 15:29), προσεκύνει αὐτῷ (Matt. 18:26), ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ (Mark 11:31), ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ (Luke 8:25), βοήθει μοι (Matt. 15:25), διηκόνουν αὐτῷ (Matt. 4:11), λατρεύειν αὐτῷ (Luke 1:74).

(c) The dative is also common with intransitive verbs which yet have personal relations. Some of these are examples of "advantage or disadvantage." Note τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ (Matt. 18:12), πρέπει ἁγίοις (Eph. 5:3), μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ (Matt. 6:25), ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Rom. 6:2), ἐρρήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις (Matt. 5:21), ἐφάνη αὐτῷ (Matt. 1:20), ἐγένετο αὐτῷ (Acts 7:40), ζῇ τῷ θεῷ (Rom. 6:10), τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει (Rom. 14:4), ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ (Mark 6:19), and even by itself as θεῷ (2 Cor. 5:13). Cf. Luke 18:31. Some of these datives are in the predicate and are called predicate datives, but the explanation is the same, personal interest. Cf. further Matt. 23:31; Jo. 16:7; Matt. 17:4; 2 Cor. 2:13,15.

(d) Indeed the dative may be used to express possession, when the predicate noun is in that case, as οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος (Luke 2:7), ὑμῖν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία (Acts 2:39), ἐὰν γένηταί τινι ἀνθρώπῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα (Matt. 18:12).

(e) What is called the ethical dative does not differ in essence

from the fundamental dative idea. It is in reality the dative of advantage or disadvantage. In fact it is little else in resultant meaning than the pure dative conception. Compare the English "hear me this," "look you," etc. So possibly Rev. 2:16, *ἔρχομαί σοι*. See also Mark 1:24, *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί*. As for *ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ* (Acts 7:20), *δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ* (2 Cor. 10:4), and *τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ* (Jas. 2:5), there may be a Hebraism (Blass), but that is not necessary, and certainly it is not straining the dative to use it thus.

(f) It is not possible to reach a final decision as to whether it is the dative or the instrumental that is sometimes used with the perfect passive. The Sanskrit had the passive so little developed that we can get little help, but the Latin seems to use the dative though we cannot be sure. The New Testament has no example of the dative with the verbal adjective in *τέος*, but in Luke 23:15 we read *οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ*. If we have here the dative, it is with the idea of having a thing done for one. See also *πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς* (Matt. 6:1), *αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι* (2 Peter 3:14) where either the dative or the instrumental is possible.

(g) The dative can be used with substantives indeed, especially verbal substantives, that have the idea of personal interest. So *εὐχαριστίαι τῷ θεῷ* (2 Cor. 9:12), *τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις* (2 Cor. 2:14). With adjectives therefore the dative is very common, such adjectives as *μονογενὴς τῇ μητρί* (Luke 7:12), *καλόν σοί ἐστιν* (Matt. 18:8), *πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ* (Acts 16:15), *ἀπειθὴς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ* (Acts 26:19), *ἱκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ* (2 Cor. 2:6), *ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ* (John 8:29), *ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ* (Matt. 10:25), *σωτήριος πᾶσιν* (Titus 2:11), *ᾧ . . . . ὑπήκοοι* (Acts 7:39), *ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* (Titus 3:8), *φανερὸν ἐγένετο τῷ Φαραώ* (Acts 7:13), *ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς* (Mark 6:48).

(h) Most of the Greek infinitives are in the dative case, all those ending in *-αι*. This is plain in the Sanskrit and in Homer, where the true dative idea is preserved usually in the infinitive. Compare the old English, "What went ye out for to see?" The infinitives in *-αι* are all dative in form though the dative idea is only preserved where design is contemplated as *ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ* (Matt. 2:2).

(i) Sometimes it is not possible to decide whether a form is

locative, instrumental, or dative, as ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ (Acts 2:33) which may be to lift up at the right hand, or by the right hand, or to the right hand.

CHAPTER XV.

PREPOSITIONS.

1. The reason for the use of prepositions. Originally in the Indo-germanic tongues there were no prepositions at all.

The Sanskrit has no proper class of prepositions. The cases at first do all the work of expressing word relations. In modern French and English (save genitive and pronouns) the prepositions do it all except what is done by the order of words. There is thus a striking development in the Indo-germanic tongues. In a word, then, prepositions are used to bring out more sharply the idea of case. The various relations between words came to be too complicated for the cases by themselves.

2. What are prepositions? They are in themselves merely adverbs. But these adverbs are themselves in cases. All prepositions then are adverbial. In Homer the adverb and the preposition go hand in hand. Instead of its being exceptional for adverbs to be used as prepositions, that is the normal history of each one. The Sanskrit began to use set case-forms of nouns as adverbial prepositions, chiefly with the genitive and accusative, and a few with locative, instrumental, and ablative. None were used with the dative, and naturally so. They were originally local in meaning (Delb., *Grund.*, *IV.*, S. 134) and the same root idea is always carried from the local usage to other applications such as time and metaphors. All prepositions were originally case-forms of nouns or pronouns and in some the case is still plain, as the locative in ἐπί, ἀντί, the accusative in χάριν (still found as substantive also). The so-called adverbial prepositions mark a stage in the progress from noun to preposition, from local adverbs to adverbs used with cases and then to fixed prepositions. It is not at all clear that the preposition was used first in composition with verbs, as the mean-

ing of the word might imply. The free position of the preposition in Homer argues against it. The preposition was always allowed freedom with verbs, sometimes separate, sometimes with the verb, and then again repeated after the verb. The case used after a compound verb is not necessarily the case common with the preposition, but rather the resultant of the preposition and the verb. Strictly speaking, prepositions do not "govern" cases. Rather the cases called in the aid of prepositions to help express more clearly case relations. Examples of the adverbial use of prepositions with no effect on the case survive in the New Testament. So ἀνά, Rev. 21:21; Mark 14:19; κατά, Rom. 12:5.

3. The so-called "improper" prepositions are therefore very proper, as proper, in fact, as any others. Every preposition is a prepositive (or, as sometimes, postpositive) adverb. The New Testament shows a considerable list, as does the κοινή (and all Greek indeed), of prepositions that are still used also as adverbs and which are not used in composition with verbs. But composition with verbs is merely a matter of development after the adverb or preposition has been formed. Here are those that meet us in the N. T.:

ἅμα with the associative instrumental (Matt. 13:29);
ἄνευ with the ablative (Matt. 10:29);
ἄντικρυς with genitive (Acts 20:15);
ἀπέναντι with genitive (Matt. 27:61);
ἄτερ with ablative (Luke 22:6);
ἄχρι with the genitive (Luke 4:13);
ἐγγύς with genitive (Jo. 3:23) or dative (Acts 9:38);
ἐκτός with ablative (2 Cor. 12:2);
ἔμπροσθεν with ablative (Matt. 5:16);
ἐναντίον with genitive (Luke 1:6);
ἕνεκα with genitive (Luke 6:22);
ἕνεκεν (Matt. 5:10), εἵνεκεν (Luke 4:18);
ἐντός with genitive (Luke 17:21);
ἐνώπιον with genitive (Lu. 1:15);
ἔξω with ablative (Matt. 10:14);
ἔξωθεν with ablative (Rev. 14:20);

ἐπάνω with genitive (Matt. 5:14);
ἐπέκεινα with ablative (Acts 7:43);
ἔσω with genitive (Mark 15:16);
ἕως with genitive (Luke 10:15);
κατέναντι with genitive (Matt. 21:2);
Cf. ἔναντι with genitive (Luke 1:8);
κατενώπιον with genitive (Eph. 1:4);
κύκλῳ with genitive (Rev. 4:6);
μέσον with genitive (Phil. 2:15);
μεταξύ with genitive (Luke 16:26);
μέχρι with genitive (Matt. 11:23);
ὀπίσω with ablative (Matt. 4:19);
ὄπισθεν with ablative (Matt. 15:23);
ὀψέ possibly ablative (Matt. 28:1);
παρεκτός with ablative (Matt. 5:32);
παραπλήσιον with genitive (Phil. 2:27);
πέραν with ablative (Mark 3:8);
πλήν with ablative (Acts 8:1);
πλησίον with genitive (John 4:5);
ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ with ablative (Eph. 3:20);
ὑπερέκεινα with ablative (2 Cor. 10:16);
ὑπεράνω with ablative (Eph. 1:21);
ὑποκάτω with ablative (Mark 6:11);
χάριν with genitive (Eph. 3:1);
χωρίς with ablative (Matt. 13:34).
ἀντίπερα with abl. or gen. (Lu. 8:26). Cf. ἀπέναντι.
κυκλόθεν with genitive (Rev. 4:3).

This list of adverbs used sometimes as prepositions will repay study. See Luke 5:19 as a study in prepositions. Cf. ἀνὰ μέσον, διὰ μέσον, ἐκ μέσον, ἐν μέσῳ, κατὰ μέσον which are practically compound prepositions.

4. The cases with which prepositions are used. Let it be remarked over again that the prepositions do not govern cases in the strict sense of that term. They are used to help out the cases, not to regulate them. The dative is not used with any of the prepositions in the N. T. except ἐγγύς. The cases used with Greek prepositions

are the accusative, locative, instrumental, ablative, and genitive. In the older Greek (Homer) the most of the prepositions were employed with two or more cases, but the tendency was constantly towards a narrower usage. There was also constant change in the application of each preposition, especially in the spoken language. In the modern Greek vernacular ἀπό actually occurs with the accusative.

5. The proper method for studying a Greek preposition. It is often true that the etymological idea is best preserved in prepositions in composition. So look at the meaning in composition as given by Hadley and Allen, as the first step, in connection with the opening definition. Hold on to the etymological meaning, seek the root idea of the case, observe the connection, and then see what the resultant conception of the whole is. Thus it will be perceived that it is not the preposition itself that changes so much as the variety of connections in which it appears. Notice, also, the metaphorical uses as really the same in principle as the original local meaning. Observe changes in case construction between Homer, Attic, and New Testament Greek. See in general Harrison on Greek Prepositions, Adams on Greek Prepositions, Curtius' Greek Etymology, Bopp, Pott, Delbrueck, Helbing, Krebs, etc.

6. ἀμφί. In locative case. See Sanskrit *abhi*, Zend *aibi*, Latin *ambo*, old German *umpi*, English *about*. It does not occur in the New Testament save in composition. So ἀμφιβάλλω Mark 1:16; ἀμφιέννυμι Matt. 6:30. ἀμφότερος occurs fourteen times according to Moulton and Geden's Concordance. See Matt. 15:14.

7. ἀνά. Its case not known, possibly instrumental. Compare ἄνω. Compare our analogy. Compare also ἄν. See Sanskrit *ana*. See Zend *ana* (with accusative). Compare Gothic *ana* (up), German *an*, English *on*. It occurs in New Testament only thirteen times, and chiefly in the distributive use and only with the accusative. See John 2:6; Luke 10:1; 1 Cor. 14:27. But it is very common in composition. Moulton and Geden give over ten pages of such examples. See Matt. 5:1; Acts 24:22; Acts 8:30; Mark 10:51; Matt. 11:28; John 6:39.

8. ἀντί. Locative case of Sanskrit *anta*. Compare Latin *ante*,

Gothic *and*, German *ant-(ent-)*, Anglo-Saxon *andlang* (*along*), *and-swerian* (*answer*). So *ante-room*, *antagonist*. Used slightly over twenty times in New Testament and always with genitive. It is not so common in composition as ἀνά although frequently used. It is an interesting preposition because of its bearing on the doctrine of the substitution theory of Christ's death. Here as always the original meaning (face to face, before) is the idea to appeal to in the explanation of every usage. See Luke 10:31 f.; 19:44; 24:17; Heb. 12:2; Matt. 5:38; 20:28; John 1:16; 19:12.

9. ἀπό. Compare ἄψ, Sanskrit *apa* (instrumental), Gothic *af*, Latin *ab*, German *ab*, English *of*, *off*. Old Greek sometimes ἀπαί. Delbrueck says in Arcadian and Cyprian dialects ἀπύ occurs and with locative. In the New Testament it is used only with the ablative, and is very common indeed. It is also extremely frequent in composition. The meaning (from, off) is generally very simple. See Matt. 3:16; 5:29; 6;13; 10:28; John 11:18; Rom. 8:23; Mark 3:14; Luke 24:41.

10. διά. Possibly instrumental although sometimes διαί (Aeschylus), locative case. Same word as δύο. So διακόσιοι. Cf. Latin *duo*, *bis*, German *zwei*, English *two*, *'tween*, from Sanskrit *dva*, *dvi*. The original local idea of "interval between" is always present. This idea together with the case idea and the meaning of the words and the connection will explain every instance of its use. The resultant idea will vary as the words, case, and circumstances vary, but the true root idea of the preposition is still discernible. The two cases used in the New Testament are the genitive and the accusative. There are hundreds of examples in the New Testament and in composition also it is very frequent. See Mark 5:4 f.; Matt. 26:61; Gal. 2:1; Rom. 11:36; Heb. 2:10; Luke 17:11; 24:51; Mark 13:20.

11. ἐν. Older form ἐνί, εἰνί, locative case. Same word as Latin *in*, German *in*, *ein*, English *in*, from Sanskrit pronominal stem and Sanskrit *ana*, *ani*, *antar* (*within*). It simply means a position within boundaries, and has really the same idea as the locative case and is so used in current Greek. However, originally, as in Latin *in*, ἐν was used with accusative (Delbrueck, p. 134) and examples

occur in Greek dialectical forms as Arcadian, Cypriote, etc. Indeed the Boeotian dialect does not have εἰς at all, but uses ἐν now with locative, now with the accusative. In English vernacular we still say, jump in the river, come in the house. Compare the so-called *constructio praegnans* of the Greek. It is the most common of all prepositions in the New Testament and abundant in composition. It is always true to its original conception, although the Hebrew conception sometimes makes unusual applications. The preposition is therefore variously translated in English idiom, but in itself only means *in*. One common vice in the study of Greek prepositions is to read the resultant idea of preposition, case, and context into the preposition, and then explain the preposition by the English translation of this resultant idea. Translation into English is one thing, and study of Greek syntax is quite another thing. The context of the word with which ἐν is used needs special attention as marking the boundary and thus giving color to the resultant idea. Even the instrumental use of ἐν is good Greek, though rare in the older tongue. See John 2:23; 4:20; 8:20; Matt. 2:6; 3:6,11; 26:23; 12:24; Rev. 6:8; Matt. 9:4; 1 Cor. 9:15; Luke 22:49.

12. εἰς. A specialized form of ἐν, as ἐνς, ἐς, εἰς. Doric and Aeolic inscriptions sometimes use εἰς with locative and ἐν with accusative. So the original meaning of ἐν and εἰς is the same. However, the two forms gradually became associated with different cases (as *in* and *into* in English). But in Latin *in* held on to both locative and accusative. Still in Greek ἐν and εἰς frequently merge in usage with verbs of motion, *constructio praegnans*. εἰς of itself means only in. The idea of into (if present) comes from the accusative case (extension) and the verb of motion and the connection. Often εἰς is used where the accusative alone would be clear. Compare ἐν. The preposition is very common in New Testament Greek, both singly and in composition. Fierce polemical battles have been waged over its usage, but the theological bearing of the preposition can come only from the context. In modern Greek εἰς displaces ἐν. See Jo. 21:23; Matt. 5:1; Mk. 1:9; Acts 8:38 f.; Mk. 13:16; Matt. 12:41; Rom. 11:36; Luke 12:10; Mark 1:4; Acts 2:38; Matt. 21:41.

13. ἐκ. In Greek as in Latin this preposition is used simply with the ablative and varies little in its usage. There is no Sanskrit equivalent, but Church Slavonic, Lithuanian, and Old Irish have the same root. It is always true to its root idea, *out of*. As with ἐν and εἰς, the word with which it is used must mark the limits and the verb describe the action. For instance, house, river, water, mountain, all present different boundaries. This preposition is also common in the New Testament, and especially so in composition. See Matt. 8:28; Luke 11:16; 6:42 f.; Mark 1:10; John 20:24; Rom. 12:18. For ἐκ, διά, εἰς see Rom. 11:36.

14. ἐπί. Compare Sanskrit adverb and prefix *ápi*, locative case. Compare Latin *ob*. Curtius says that it is allied to Sanskrit *ápa* (ἀπό) in spite of difference of meaning. Compare English *up*, German *auf*. ἐπί means over, upon, but less sharply than ἀνά and ὑπέρ. It is very common in the New Testament separately, and fairly so in composition. It is used with the genitive, locative, and accusative. Observe the case idea, and meaning of the words and the context. See Matt. 6:10; John 19:19; Matt. 3:7; 7:24; 26:55; Luke 3:2; Acts 11:19; Rev. 7:1.

15. Κατά. Καταί (locative or dative) occurs in some poems. It means "down," but the etymology is not known. Compare our cataract, catastrophe. Quite common in New Testament, both singly and in composition. The cases used with it are the gen., acc., abl. (Acts 27:14). In the older Greek the ablative was also possible. The resultant idea does not vary very much. "Against" comes from the idea of "down." Compare our being "down on" a person. See Matt. 8:32; Mark 11:25; Luke 4:14; 8:1,39; John 8:15; Acts 26:3; Rom. 2:1.

16. μετά. Instrumental case. Compare μέσος. Sanskrit *mithas* (genitive), Gothic *mith*, Latin *medius*, German *mit* (*miti*), English *mid*. This preposition is used with the locative, genitive, and accusative in Homer. In the New Testament only the accusative and genitive usages survive. It is quite common, and moderately so in composition. The sense of "after" as a resultant idea with the accusative seems difficult; but in Homer the accusative is used with verbs of motion with the idea of "into the midst of." Clearly

the notions of "extension" (accusative) and "midst" combined explain the resultant idea of "after," with possibly the idea of "succession" suggested by the context. See Mark 1:13; 10:30; Matt. 3:2; 21:30; Jo. 3:25; Acts 1:5; 10:5; 2 Cor. 3:18; Lu. 22:52 f.

17. παρά. Epic παραί is locative or possibly dative and παρά instrumental (Curtius) as Sanskrit has *param* (accusative), *para* (instrumental), and *pare* (locative). Compare Latin *per*, German *ver*, English *for*—in forswear, forbid, etc. Skeat makes English *far* same as Sanskrit *paras* (beyond). So "alongside" is the root idea and can be seen in every example with proper observation of case idea and context. It is used with the locative, accusative, and ablative in the New Testament, and is particularly common in composition. Compare parallel, parable, paradox, etc. See Mark 14:43; Luke 18:9; 19:7; John 19:25; Rom. 2:13; Matt. 4:18; Rom. 4:18,25; Heb. 1:4; 2:2.

18. περί. Compare Greek πέριξ, περισσός and particle περ (Hartung). περί is locative case. Compare Sanskrit *pari*, round about, and Zend *pairi*. So Latin *per* before adjectives (Curtius). Harrison says that περί as compared with ἀμφί (on both sides) is rather placing round about, alongside of round about. The root is the same as that of παρά (see Sanskrit). It is used in Homer and even Attic with the locative, but not so in the New Testament. Here it is used only with the genitive, accusative, and possibly with the ablative (Delbrueck). The ablative certainly occurs with it in Homer. It is found with considerable frequency in composition and alone. See Acts 18:25; 1 Jo. 2:2; Mark 9:42; Luke 10:40; Acts 1:3; Luke 17:2; 2 Cor. 3:16; 1 Thess. 5:10; John 18:19.

19. πρό. Compare πρότερος, πρῶτος (Doric πρᾶτος), πρόσω, etc. So Sanskrit *pra* as prefix and Zend *fra* (instrumental case), Latin *prod* (ablative), *pro*, *prae* (*prai*, locative), German *vor*, English *fro*, *for*, *fore*. The case of πρό is uncertain. Compare Latin ablative and also ἀπό. There are some signs in Homer that πρό was once used with the locative, but it is in later Greek seen only with the ablative (Delbrueck). The idea is really comparison and so ablative as with ὑπέρ. It is used in the New Testament more frequently than ἀμφί, ἀνά, and ἀντί, but not so often as many other

prepositions. In composition it is common. The root idea is always present even when the resultant idea is substitution as in ancient Greek and Latin, but it is not used in this sense in the New Testament. See Acts 12:6; Luke 11:38; James 5:12; 2 Cor. 12:2; Gal. 3:1.

20. *πρός.* A longer form of *πρό* as *εἰς* is of *ἐν* and *ἐξ* of *ἐκ*, occurs also as *προτί* (Doric), locative, and in nine (Curtius) other forms all akin to Sanskrit *prati* (locative) which is used with accusative and ablative. The meaning is the same as *πρό*, before. It is used with three cases (locative, accusative, ablative) according to Delbrueck. But Monro insists that it is genitive and not ablative. In the New Testament only one ablative (genitive) occurs, Acts 27:34. There are only six locative examples and all the rest are in the accusative. It is one of the commonest prepositions in the New Testament and abounds in compound words. Many of the examples are of great interest. Examine according to preceding principles Mark 5:22; 6:51; Acts 23:30; John 1:1; 20:11; Luke 7:44; 18:11; Heb. 5:14; Matt. 11:3.

21. *σύν.* Older form *ξύν.* Ionic *ξυνός* (*κοινός*) according to Curtius. Compare Latin *cum*, *con*, *co* (*ν* in Greek as in accusative ending). Compare Sanskrit *sam* and Greek *ἅμα.* Mommsen says that *σύν* is used with the instrumental in both of its ideas, proper instrument or help, and the associative instrumental (together with). But the associative idea (Delbrueck, Harrison) is doubtless the root idea in *σύν.* It is used very little in the New Testament, save by Luke and Paul, but in composition it is exceedingly common. See Lu. 7:12; Rom. 8:32; Matt. 27:44; Acts 15:15; 2 Tim. 2:11; Acts 16:10; 1 Cor. 8:7; 2 Cor. 5:14.

22. *ὑπέρ.* *ὑπέρα* (upper rope). Compare Sanskrit *upari* (locative case of *upara*) with locative, accusative, and genitive. Zend *upairi* (locative) with accusative and instrumental. Latin *super*, Gothic *ufar*, German *ueber*, Anglo-Saxon *ofer*, English *over.* These are all comparative forms, Sanskrit positive *upa*, Greek *ὑπό.* Chaucer uses over in sense of upper. This preposition is used only with the ablative and accusative, generally ablative in New Testament. As a comparative the case would be ablative rather than genitive.

See Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, p. 147. It is used rather frequently in the New Testament, but sparingly in composition. Much interest centers around this preposition because of its use by Paul concerning the death of Christ, whereas Jesus used ἀντί twice. It is insisted that ἀντί is necessary to express the doctrine of substitution, and that in using ὑπέρ Paul avoided that doctrine. But neither ἀντί nor ὑπέρ of itself expresses substitution. One means in itself "face to face" and the other "over." Both, however, in the proper connection are used freely when that is the resultant idea. In fact, in Alcestis (Euripides) ὑπέρ is used more frequently than ἀντί and πρό with this idea. All three prepositions yield themselves naturally to the idea of substitution where the connection calls for it. Here, as always, the root idea of the preposition, the root idea of the case, and the context must all be considered. See Acts 1:13; Mark 9:40; Matt. 10:24; Lu. 16:8; Heb. 7:27; Philemon 13; John 11:50; 2 Cor. 5:14; Gal. 3:13; 1 Tim. 2:6.

23. ὑπό. Also ὑπαί (dative or locative). Aeolic ὑπά. Sanskrit *upa* (near, on, under) with locative, accusative, and instrumental. Zend *upa* with accusative and locative. Latin *sub*, Gothic *uf*. Compare English *ab-ove*. The ideas "on" or "under" both depend on standpoint and do not differ much after all. Monro suggests that the original sense is "upwards" (compare ὕψι, aloft, and ὕπτιος, facing upwards). At any rate ὑπό is not, like κατά, used of motion downwards. Hence the comparative (see ὑπέρ) and the superlative (Sanskrit *upamas*, Greek ὕπατος, Latin *summus*, English *oft*) are perfectly natural. It is freely used in the New Testament and often in composition. The locative no longer occurs with it, as in earlier Greek, but the accusative, genitive, and possibly ablative. In expressions of agency ὑπό is the direct agent whereas διά is the intermediate agent. Other prepositions are also used to express agent as ἐκ, ἀπό, παρά, πρός. It is used only twice in the Gospel of John, once in the Epistles of John, and twice in the Revelation, and is thus an incidental argument for identity of authorship. It is specially common in the writings of Luke and Paul. See Luke 11:33; Gal. 3:25; Matt. 5:13; John 1:48; Matt. 1:22; 4:1; Mark 5:4; Matt. 6:2; Acts 6:11.

CHAPTER XVI.

GENERAL REMARKS ABOUT THE VERB.

1. The name is not distinctive. In a sense all the rest of Greek syntax centers around the verb (the word *par excellence* of the sentence) save intensive particles and figures of speech. The verb is the bone of the sentence. Indeed the Greek verb may be a sentence in itself containing both subject and predicate as ἀπέθανεν. There is therefore an appropriateness in calling this part of speech the word (ῥῆμα).

2. The function of the verb. The verb contains two ideas, action (including "state") and affirmation. Action may be also expressed by substantives and adjectives, but not affirmation. Verbs make affirmation by limiting the action to certain persons. This limitation is made by personal endings which also distinguish the voices. These personal endings are probably oblique cases of pronouns.

3. The two types of verbs. As we know, in the Greek verb we see what are called the μι verbs and the ω verbs with some differences of inflections in several tenses. But originally there was only one inflection, the μι, whereas in modern Greek the ω forms have displaced all the μι forms save in εἶμαι. The ω verbs arose from the dropping of μι and other endings and the addition of the variable vowel. The New Testament, like the rest of the κοινή, represents the transition period of the language in this matter, but further on towards the ω victory than the earlier Attic.

4. The infinitive and the participle are not verbs in the strict sense, as will be readily seen. They have no personal endings, and so cannot make affirmation. In modern languages the personal ending is dropping off, and the verb depends on the separate expression of the personal pronoun for its limitation. Infinitives

and participles are *quasi* verbs, verbal nouns, possessing voice and tense and being used with cases as verbs. They are hybrids, the infinitive a verbal substantive, the participle a verbal adjective. They are not now verb, now noun, but both at the same time.

5. How the verb is made. It is a complicated process which cannot be entered into here, since it properly belongs to accidence, not syntax. See chapter VII., Conjugation of the Verb. But the verb is a growth and a very complex growth at that. "The verb expresses *action* (or state) and *affirms* it of a *subject.* It therefore has *tense, mode, voice, person* and *number;* expressed by stem, connecting vowel, *ending.*"—H. H. Harris.

6. To understand the verb then is to understand each of these processes. Mode, voice, tense, person, number, all have a specific idea. The total result is the idea of the verb in a given instance. The alphabet of the verb is to know the forms by the form itself, not by the English translation. It is useless to attempt explanation before this elementary stage is reached. Voice pertains to the action of the verb as regards the subject of the action. Tense has to do with the action of the verb as regards the state of the action, and in the indicative expresses time also. Mode pertains to the manner of affirmation, how it is made.

7. There is one other matter of importance to note also. It is the meaning of the word itself, the root, apart from any or all of the processes just named. The same tense of "blink the eye" and "live a life" do not convey exactly the same idea. The difference is due to the thing which is mentioned in each instance, the nature of the case. The Germans call this "Aktionsart," kind of action. It plays an important part, especially in the study of the tenses. The late recognition of this common sense matter is not a great compliment to grammarians.

8. The development of mode, voice, tense was necessarily more or less simultaneous. There is no essential order for the discussion of them therefore. In the beginning there was probably only one mode, one voice, one tense. The rest were built up around them with more or less completeness. In the Greek the system was never carried out logically either in mode, voice or tense. The English

verb has, however, far greater limitations apart from the help of auxiliaries. But the Greek verb is much richer than the Sanskrit and even than the Latin.

9. Individual verbs show very unequal development as to mode, voice, and tense. Some have pretty free play in most directions. Others fall far short of their opportunities, failing in either one or the other point. These are called defective or else deponent verbs. Deponent is rather a misnomer and defective is a much better description of the facts as to voice as well as tense.

10. Once more the modes, voices, and tenses varied greatly in their history. Some survived and flourished. Others barely existed or perished. There was a survival of the fittest. The grammarian like the true historian must tell the important facts in each case.

11. Probably tense was earlier than mode or voice, though it does not matter greatly how they are studied because a large part of the development was parallel. The second aorist (coinciding with present) is the oldest tense. The indicative is the oldest mode. The active is probably the oldest voice, but the middle may be.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE MODES.

1. The use of ἄν with the modes. There is much difficulty in understanding ἄν. It is used with all the modes, save the imperative. It is freely used in Homer with the future indicative and the subjunctive. So Tatian (pp. 80, 94) has ἄν with the future indicative. It is, however, chiefly found in dependent clauses. In the New Testament it is thus found with the indicative as well as the subjunctive. In independent clauses ἄν in the New Testament occurs with the indicative and the optative. It is not true that relative and conditional subjunctive clauses "must also have ἄν." It is usually present, but is not necessary. Leo Meyer argues that Greek ἄν is kin to Gothic *an* and Latin *an*, and originally had two meanings, one "else," the other "in that case rather," Latin and Gothic preserving the first and Greek the second. Cf. also old English "an"=if. Monro argues that the primary use of ἄν and κέ in Homer is with definite and particular examples, and that the indefinite and general use is secondary. In the New Testament both exist, although the general usage is more common. See Mark 11:19; 6:56. Sometimes ἄν is spelt ἐάν (Matt. 5:19). More in detail in conditional and relative sentences.

2. What is mode? Mode is manner and pertains to affirmation, and not to action as do voice and tense. The personal endings limit the affirmation; mode is in a sense the dress of the affirmation. As to the manner of affirming, there are three possible kinds of statement: definite, doubting, commanding. But they are not of equal age nor frequency. The four modes really represent three points of view since the subjunctive and optative are so much alike in idea. They and the imperative ultimately grow out of the indicative and the old injunctive.

3. Positive statement. The Greek has one mode of definite assertion. It is called the indicative; not a very good name since all the modes indicate. With this mode one affirms positively, definitely, absolutely, undoubtingly. One may or may not tell what he knows to be true, but he *states* it as real. Mode has nothing *per se* to do with the actual facts, but only with the statement of them. Most untruths are expressed in the indicative mode. The indicative is the normal manner of affirmation unless there is reason to be doubtful or to make a command. It is thus the one most used and has the most complete set of tenses as to the time element. The indicative always stands for itself. The modes, like the tenses, are not interchanged. The indicative is so much the usual mode that some grammarians do not consider it a mode at all. It does not indeed have a distinctive mode-sign like the subjunctive and optative, but neither does the imperative. The indicative is the natural manner of expressing a thing unless there is special reason for one of the other modes. It is indeed the mode *par excellence* instead of being no mode at all. The Greeks used the indicative according to the genius of their own language. One must see to it that he does not read English into the Greek indicative, though, as a matter of fact, the English indicative has practically supplanted the old subjunctive. The application of the general principle of the indicative will tide one over every instance if he gives due weight to the context. Some striking examples are given in lieu of extended discussion. See the point in the indicative mode in ποιοῦμεν (Jo. 11:47); ἔδει (Jo. 4:4; Matt. 23:23; and Matt. 25:27); ἐβουλόμην (Acts 25:22); ἐραννᾶτε (Jo. 5:39); ἀγαπήσεις (Matt. 5:43); θέλω (1 Cor. 7:7) and ἤθελον (Gal. 4:20); ηὐχόμην (Rom. 9:3); παραζηλοῦμεν (1 Cor. 10:22); ὄψεσθε (Matt. 27:24).

4. Doubtful statement. The Greek has two modes for doubting affirmation, the subjunctive and the optative. The names are not distinctive, for both are used in subordinate senses, and the optative is used elsewhere besides in wishes and is not the only mode so used (see indicative). But the names will answer at any rate. They are really different forms of the same mode, the mode

of hesitating affirmation. Compare the Latin which has no optative, but a past subjunctive. In Greek the subjunctive is chiefly primary and the optative chiefly secondary, but the distinction is not always observed. The Greek love of vivid statement made the subjunctive more popular than the optative and kept it increasingly after past tenses of the indicative. There is thus no sequence of tenses in Greek, but a sequence of modes. But this sequence of modes is not necessary. In fact in the New Testament it is exceptional, for the optative had nearly disappeared from use. In modern Greek it no longer exists. In the ancient vernacular the optative was not used so much as in the books. It was one of the luxuries of the language that the spoken language little used. It is scarce in Plutarch, and occurs only sixty-seven times in the New Testament. The optative died as the subjunctive is doing in English. In the New Testament wishes about the future are expressed by the optative or sometimes by ὄφελον and the future indicative. Wishes about the present are expressed simply by ὄφελον and the imperfect indicative. Wishes about the past are expressed by ὄφελον and the aorist indicative. The subjunctive has to do the work of the imperative in the first person owing to loss of that form. The use of the aorist subjunctive in prohibitions rather than the aorist imperative is traceable to the Sanskrit idiom. But the aorist imperative in prohibitions does occur a few times in the New Testament. Even the second and third persons are used sometimes in the New Testament in questions of deliberation. The future indicative is doubtful because the action is future, and so it is not strange that Homer uses both the subjunctive and the future indicative for future statements. Compare ἵνα and ἐάν in the New Testament with either subjunctive or future indicative. The negative of the subjunctive is μή, of the optative οὐ or μή. It needs to be remarked that the modes have precisely the same force in independent and dependent clauses. The particular construction of the subjunctive and optative with various dependent clauses comes up later. Here the root idea is insisted on which lies behind it all. As a matter of fact only the most general idea of doubtful statement will hold, for both the

subjunctive and optative are difficult of scientific analysis. The subjunctive glides into the realm of the future indicative on the one hand, if indeed it is not a variation of it (see Homer), and into the sphere of the imperative on the other where in fact it is supreme in the first person. The optative is not alone wish or will. The potential idea exists also and the doctors much disagree as to which is the original and how to relate the two conceptions. In the Latin the optative vanished utterly before the subjunctive, while in the Sanskrit the subjunctive largely succumbed before the optative. The Greek indeed developed both side by side though the optative was chiefly confined to books as remarked above. The subjunctive is more common in Homer than in later Greek. Some examples of the subjunctive and optative in the New Testament worth considering are here given. Ἔχωμεν (Rom. 5:1); γένοιτο (Gal. 6:14); φύγητε (Matt. 23:33); εὐξαίμην ἄν (Acts 26:29); ἂν θέλοι (Acts 17:18); μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς (Matt. 6:13); ποιήσωμεν (Luke 3:10); τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη (Luke 9:46); γένηται (Luke 23:31); ἑτοιμάσωμεν (Luke 22:9); εἴη (Luke 22:23); παραδῷ (Luke 22:4); φάγω (Luke 22:16); εἴπωμεν (Luke 9:54. Cf. ποιήσῃς, Mark 10:35. See infinitive with θέλει in verse 43). For ἄφες ἴδωμεν see (Matt. 27:49). As examples of ὄφελον take Rev. 3:15; Gal. 5:12; 1 Cor. 4:8.

5. Commanding statement. The imperative is the mode for commands, the assertion of one's will on another's. This mode is somewhat allied in form to the indicative and is a development in meaning of an emphatic indicative in some of its forms which are identical with the indicative. Compare our "you shall." The indicative in that vigorous sense is often found in Greek, as ὄψεσθε (Matt. 27:24). Here one's duty is stated as a prediction. Often it is hard to decide between the imperative and the indicative when the forms are identical, but the connection will generally decide, as in ἴστε (Jas. 1:19; Eph. 5:5). Other forms of the imperative are interjectional (cf. δεῦτε, Matt. 11:28) or allied to the subjunctive or the old injunctive like λύθητε and similar forms. Still others have special endings. So the imperative is on the whole a makeshift and an afterthought in the modes. The aorist subjunctive held its own in prohibitions of the second person and

usually of the third as the subj. did completely for all commands of the first person. In the imperative as with all the modes the meaning of the word itself and of the context has to be considered. Hence one can see how the imperative is used in ὀργίζεσθε (Eph. 4:25). Cf. also ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ (Lu. 10:28). Instead of the imperative we sometimes have ἵνα (Eph. 5:33). The negative of the imperative naturally is always μή as with the subjunctive after Homer. The indicative and optative use either οὐ or μή according to the idea involved. Observe δός (Matt. 5:42), ἄφες ἐκβάλω (Matt. 7:4), λύσατε (Jo. 2:19), καταδικάζετε and ἀπολύετε (Lu. 6:37), ἴσθι ἔχων (Lu. 19:17), ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω (Matt. 9:31), ἴστε γινώσκοντες (Eph. 5:5), καταβάτω (Mk. 13:15), βάπτισαι (Acts 22:16). In 1 Pet. 5:12 observe εἰς ἣν στῆτε.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE VOICES.

1. What is voice in the verb? Voice is *vox*, the speaking part of the verb, and this is not a bad name for the function. Voice has to do with the subject of the action, the one of whom the affirmation is made by the mode.

2. The names of the voices are not specially felicitous. All verbs express action or state in all the voices, and verbs that express only state like εἰμί have the active voice. The middle means nothing in particular. If the idea is that it comes in between active and passive, that is not true and hence a misnomer. If it refers to the fact that there is a reflex action in this voice, this is true, but a poor way of expressing it. Reflexive voice would convey that idea much better. The term passive is not so bad in the original sense of that word. We have to use the terms simply because they are in vogue.

3. The voices have nothing *per se* to do with the question whether the verb is transitive or intransitive. That matter belongs to the individual verb and is in reality a question of "Aktionsart," not of the voice at all. The active voice, for instance, may be either transitive or intransitive and often the same verb will be used now one way, now the other. The same remark applies to the middle voice. Some verbs indeed in both these voices will have more than one object. The verb in the passive voice again is sometimes transitive also, though in the nature of the case it is more usually intransitive. The point is that voice must be considered entirely apart from the question of transitiveness. That is another matter to be raised on other grounds.

4. The active voice represents the subject merely as acting. That is all. It is therefore the commonest and most natural voice to

use. It is also probably the oldest. Some verbs never had any other voice. Some verbs have one voice in one tense, and another voice in another tense. In simple truth many verbs are more or less defective on this point.

5. The middle was probably built on the active by a doubling of the personal ending, $\mu\iota$ becoming $\mu\alpha\mu\iota = \mu\alpha\iota$. This explanation is not certain, some scholars even putting the middle as the oldest voice. But certainly the middle was on a par with the active at most points and had a parallel development. The active and the middle had a full set of personal endings. In the middle voice the subject is acting with reference to himself, and here again the action may be either transitive or intransitive. *How* the subject acts with reference to himself, the middle voice does not tell. That has to be determined by the meaning of the verb and the context. He may be represented as doing a certain thing of himself, by himself, on himself, for himself, etc. The precise shade of emphasis comes from the context and the word itself. The reflexive pronoun is sometimes used in the New Testament with the middle though it is not necessary. In English the reflexive pronoun is the only way that the middle idea can be expressed.

6. The passive represents the subject as acted upon. The passive is later than the active and the middle and did not develop distinctive personal endings. In most cases, like a parasite, it used the middle endings as in Latin throughout. In the future passive there was a special suffix $\theta\epsilon(\epsilon)$ as in the aorist passive when the active endings were employed. It is a curious perversion of facts and irony of fate that the grammars have so long regarded the middle as the interloper. Some languages indeed have never developed a passive, the Coptic, for instance. The Sanskrit has the barest beginning of the passive in one conjugation while the active and middle are in full swing. English can only express the passive by the auxiliary verb to be and the participle.

7. The history of the middle and passive has been one of the most interesting in the Greek language. Originally there was no passive. The Boeotian dialect uses the passive very seldom. In modern Greek there are few distinctive middles, so completely has the

passive captured the middle. In the New Testament the middle is already disappearing before the passive. In μὴ φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς (Matt. 10:26) the passive form is used, but not the passive idea. So also the common ἀποκριθείς (Matt. 3:15). In Homer there is no future passive and the second aorist passive is rare. Indeed the aorist middle and the aorist passive are not always distinct in Homer as 'βλῆτο (he was struck). Cf. Sterrett, Homer's *Iliad*, *The Dialect of Homer*, p. 27. All this is in harmony with the development of the passive from the middle and active.

8. The term deponent as applied to the middle and passive is largely a misnomer. Many of the tenses were defective and did not develop forms in all the voices. Hence it is not proper to say that they laid aside (*depono*) what they had never assumed. However, as between the middle and the passive, as shown above, the middle gradually disappeared as the passive usurped both form and function. But the term deponent is not usually applied to this particular matter. The following examples will illustrate the voices in the New Testament:

1 Cor. 5:11 (ἔγραψα, συναναμίγνυσθαι, ὀνομαζόμενος); 6:7 (ἀδικεῖσθε); 6:11 (ἀπελούσασθε, ἡγιάσθητε); 13:12 (γινώσκω, ἐπιγνώσομαι, ἐπεγνώσθην); Lu. 20:11 (προσέθετο); 20:13 (ἐντραπήσονται); Matt. 27:5 (ἀπήγξατο); Matt. 27:24 (ἀπενίψατο); Mk. 14:47 (σπασάμενος); 14:65 (ἤρξαντο); Luke 2:5 (ἀπογράψασθαι); Acts 22:16 (βάπτισαι); Acts 12:8 (ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι); Gal. 2:7 (πεπίστευμαι); 2 Thess. 2:15 (ἐδιδάχθητε); Matt. 9:38 (δεήθητε); Matt. 10:9 (κτήσησθε); 10:28 (φοβηθῆτε); Titus 2:7 (σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος).

CHAPTER XIX.

THE TENSES.

1. The name tense (French *temps*) is a mistake. Time is not the basal idea. This name does not represent the original and essential matter. Time belongs only to the indicative mode in Greek save by indirection, and is not the main idea in the indicative. In the other modes time is not expressed, and is only suggested by the relation to other parts of the sentence or context. In Latin time appears in the subjunctive also. Time is distinctly a secondary development in tense grafted on the main idea. Cf. Delbrueck, *Grundlagen*, p. 80.

2. But what is the fundamental idea in tense? The state of the action is the *main* idea of tense, and not merely an additional idea as Hadley and Allen have it. This is the original and only general idea of tense.

3. There are three distinct ideas as to duration of the action found in all the modes, viz., incompletion, completion, or indefiniteness. These three conceptions cover all the kinds of action there are as to duration. In the indicative, where time is also expressed, there might have been each of these three conceptions in distinct forms in past, present, and future. As a matter of fact, the conceptions exist, but only in the past is there distinct expression with three tenses. The ideas are used, however, in the present and future, but not with separate tenses. The tense in the New Testament is used in accordance with the true Greek idiom, save that the Hebrew conception has sometimes in translation Greek determined the point of view. But in New Testament Greek one tense is not used "for" another. That is an abomination of grammar. We must beware of explaining Greek tenses from the English translation.

The tense for indefinite action is the aorist, the tenses for incompleted action are the present, imperfect, and future; the tenses for completed action are the present perfect, past perfect (pluperfect), and future perfect.

4. Here again we must insist on looking at the Greek tense from the Greek standpoint, and not from the English or German point of view. Each Greek tense has its meaning and is used to express that idea. What the English would have used is quite another matter. Historical grammar is essential to exegetical grammar, and the best exegetical grammar maintains the Greek standpoint. It is not necessary to anglicize the Greek idiom in order to understand it; to do so is rather to hinder true apprehension, for the student will inevitably feel that the Greek ought to be like the English. The English will be the standard and Greek rises or falls as it is like or unlike it. If Greek syntax is not understood as Greek, it is not truly understood.

5. Indefinite action—the aorist. The aorist is presented first because it is normally the oldest form of the Greek verb. The aorist and present in many verbs had the same stem like *φη-μί*, for instance. Cf. *ἔ-φη-ν* with *ἔ-στη-ν*. The so-called second aorist is older than the first aorist. The root of a verb is found in the second aorist, if it has this tense. The Greek tenses seem to have been built up around the second aorist. The aorist is the simplest in idea. It is unlimited action, *ἀόριστος*, both as to duration and as to time. The augment (an example of pre-flection) in the indicative shows past time, but the tense as a tense has no time. It is simple action without representing it either as incompleted or completed. It may in fact be either, but the aorist does not say so. The Greek is an "aorist loving language" (Broadus). A statement in the indicative would naturally be in the aorist unless there is reason to put it in some other tense, and so of the other modes. If the action is not to be described as completed or incompleted, put it in the aorist. General statements or illustrations are often put in the aorist and you are left to draw the inference. This is really a representative aorist. Some verbs of special meanings will have different shades of meaning in different tenses, and this is only

natural. It is the tense idea plus the verb meaning. In the indicative the aorist is past time because of the augment; in the participle it is contemporaneous or by suggestion past or future; it is by suggestion present or future in the subjunctive, optative, imperative, and infinitive. The infinitive in indirect discourse has past time only by suggestion. But in all this diversity as to time, the idea of simple action is always present. The aorist is not used "for" the present perfect, the past perfect, or the present. Hadley and Allen are here explaining Greek by the English. See the exact force of the Greek aorist in every instance. That force is well represented by Moulton (*Prolegomena*, p. 109) as punctiliar or point action. The thing to bear in mind is that the aorist *represents* the action as a point. In itself it may have continued a long time. It is precisely the idea of the aorist (undefined action) that it does not distinguish between complete or incomplete action. It may be used of either. Take οἰκοδομήθη (Jo. 2:20), for instance, which covers the space of forty-six years as the "point." Just here "*Aktionsart*" comes in also. The particular meaning of the word itself may stress the beginning, the end, or the action as a whole. The German grammarians have given special names to the resultant ideas, that is, the aorist plus the meaning of the word. For the beginning *ingressive* as νοσῆσαι (to fall sick), for the end *effective* as τελέσαι (to complete) or πληρῶσαι (Matt. 5:17), for the act as a whole *constative* (not a very good term) as ζῆσαι (to live). Sometimes indeed the same word can be used for each of these ideas as βαλεῖν may be "let fly," "hit," or merely "throw" (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 130). So then in the aorist the tense idea is to be combined with the word idea. It may be added that in the past indicative, in the subjunctive, the optative, the positive imperative, the aorist is the tense used as a matter of course unless stress is to be laid on the ideas either of incompletion or completion. The Greek tenses are not always made from the same stem. These examples will illustrate the New Testament aorist. Matt. 3:17 (εὐδόκησα); Matt. 25:5 (ἐνύσταξαν); Matt. 9:18 (ἐτελεύτησεν; observe ἄρτι); Matt. 12:28 (ἔφθασεν); Mark 11:24 (ἐλάβετε); Matt. 23:2 (ἐκάθισαν); Jo. 10:38 (γνῶτε, but cf. γινώσκητε); Luke 1:30 (εὗρες);

2:48 (ἐποίησας); 16:4 (ἔγνων, μεταστραθῶ); 23:19 (ἦν βληθείς); 24:17 (ἐστάθησαν); James 1:11 (ἀνέτειλεν); 1:24 (ἐπελάθετο); Rom. 3:23 (ἥμαρτον); 15:15 (ἔγραψα); Mark 5:39 (ἀπέθανεν); 5:42 (ἀνέστη, but note περιεπάτει); 1 Cor. 7:28 (ἥμαρτες). In Luke 23:19 (ἦν βληθείς) we have the aorist participle with ἦν.

6. Incompleted action—(present, imperfect, and future). Present and future tenses are named from the point of view of time, while the imperfect is named from the standpoint of state of duration. It would have been better to have had all the names consistent. The imperfect in Greek is a past imperfect, and the present is a present imperfect, and the future is a future imperfect. But it should be noted that the present indicative is also often aoristic and the future is usually so. In the indicative no clear distinction between indefinite and incomplete action is made in present and future time. In the other modes the present tense is more free from this complication. The idea of incompletion or linear action runs through all the modes and is a variation from the aorist conception. See formation of the present from aorist root stems. The idea of time concerning the incompleted action appears properly only in the indicative where all three points of time occur. The subjunctive has no time of its own, and only the present tense for incompletion. The so-called future subjunctive is a later development. The optative is similarly situated, save that there is a future optative, which, however, is only used in indirect discourse where in the direct form the future indicative was used. The same thing is true of the infinitive, the future infinitive representing the future indicative, save with μέλλω, when there is a future idea in the word (but μέλλω uses also present and aorist infinitives). The future participle corresponds to the future indicative by suggestion, especially with the idea of purpose in the context. But this is a very rare construction in the New Testament. There is no future imperative. So, then, the imperfect or past incompletion is confined to the indicative, the future or future incompletion is nearly so if indirect discourse is borne in mind. The present is the normal tense for incompletion in all the modes. The stem of the imperfect is the same as that of the present.

(a) The present.

So, then, the present tense expresses incompleted action, which action in any given case may be momentary, prolonged, simultaneous, descriptive, repeated, customary, attempted, interrupted, or begun, according to the nature of the case or the meaning of the verb itself. In vivid narration past or future incompleted action can be conceived of and stated in the present indicative. This is not a peculiarity of language at all. It is simply a lively imagination that changes its point of view. No distinctive effort is made to present the aorist idea in the present time (indicative). That idea is merged with the present tense without distinction. Sometimes the idea of incompletion is intensified by the use of the verb εἰμί and the participle as in English and Hebrew. The so-called historical present in the midst of aorists and imperfects is just the lively imagination of the narrator drawing the picture closer. It is not the present used for the other tenses. The hearer or reader is expected to wake up and see the picture. The same thing is true of the present in the midst of futures. Some verbs naturally suggest future action like εἶμι. Indeed some future tenses like εἶμι, πίομαι are thus merely lively presents. In Homer, as is well known, the present and imperfect stems are not always differentiated from the aorist. The periphrastic present is not uncommon. Another thing to be noted about the present tense is the effect of prepositions on the word, *Aktionsart* again. It is a pity that the term *perfective* is applied by the new grammarians to this effect of some prepositions in composition. It has nothing to do with the perfect tense, and it is necessarily confusing to some extent. If ἐργάζεσθαι is to work, κατεργάζεσθαι (Phil. 2:12) is to work down. So γινώσκειν is to know, ἐπιγινώσκειν is to know thoroughly. The list can be easily extended. Sometimes the simple verb represents the incomplete idea like θνήσκειν (to be dying), while the compound aorist sums up the whole like ἀποθανεῖν (to die). See καταλῦσαι (Matt. 5:17). The following examples of the present will set forth fairly well New Testament usage: Matt. 2:4 (γεννᾶται); 3:1 (παραγίνεται); 3:10 (κεῖται); 3:15 (πρέπον ἐστίν); 5:25 (ἴσθι εὐνοῶν, εἶ); 6:2 (ποιοῦσιν, ἀπέχουσιν); 25:8 (σβέννυνται); 26:18 (ποιῶ); 27:33 (ἐστὶν λεγόμενος);

Mk. 11:23 (γίνεται); Lu. 17:6 (ἔχετε); 18:12 (κτῶμαι); 19:8 (δίδωμι); 19:17 (ἴσθι ἔχων); 22:23 (εἴη); 22:24 (δοκεῖ); Jo. 3:15 (ἔχῃ); 10:32 (λιθάζετε); 10:38 (πιστεύητε, γινώσκητε); 14:3 (ἔρχομαι); Heb. 3:12 βλέπετε); Rev. 1:18 (ζῶν εἰμί); Mk. 4:38 (ἀπολλύμεθα).

(b) The imperfect.

The imperfect likewise expresses incompleted action which in any given case may be either momentary, simultaneous, prolonged, descriptive, repeated, customary, interrupted, attempted, or begun, according to the context or the meaning of the verb. Too much has been read into the Greek tenses and not enough allowance is always made for the meaning of the verb itself. To wink the eye, for instance, is obviously different as to length of duration from eating one's dinner and living a life. With due regard to this point and the context the Greek imperfect will be found always true to its root idea. The participle with εἰμί is very common in the New Testament, especially in Luke. The imperfect is the descriptive tense of narrative and varies the simple monotony of the aorist. It puts life into the story like the present. Some imperfects that are very common like ἔλεγεν perhaps do not differ in stem from an old second aorist (cf. ἔλαβεν). In English we must use the auxiliary verb and the participle if we wish to accent linear action either in the past, the present, or the future. In Matt. 9:24 note carefully ἀπέθανεν, καθεύδει, κατεγέλων. The meaning of the word (*Aktionsart*) is to be observed in the imperfect tense also. It is interesting to compare imperfects with aorists or perfects in the same sentence and see the reason for the difference. Examine, for instance, these New Testament examples: Matt. 3:6 (ἐβαπτίζοντο); 3:14 (διεκώλυεν); 26:55 (ἐκαθεζόμην); 27:30 (ἔτυπτον); Mk. 12:41 (ἐθεώρει); 14:61 (ἐσιώπα); 14:72 (ἔκλαιεν); 15:6 (ἀπέλυεν); 15:23 (ἐδίδουν); Mk. 5:13 (ἐπνίγοντο); Lu. 1:21 (ἦν προσδοκῶν; cf. 1:22, ἦν διανεύων); 1:59 (ἐκάλουν); 17:10 (ὠφείλομεν); 17:27 (ἤσθιον, etc.); 23:12 (προϋπῆρχον ὄντες); Jo. 21:18 (ἐζώννυες, etc.); Acts 18:4 (ἔπειθεν); 27:18 (ἐποιοῦντο); Eph. 5:4 (ἀνῆκεν); Acts 22:22 (καθῆκεν); Matt. 23:23 (ἔδει); Lu. 24:26 (ἔδει); Matt. 25:5 (ἐκάθευδον).

(c) The future.

The future likewise presents incompleted action which in any

case may be either momentary, instantaneous, prolonged, descriptive, repeated, customary, interrupted, attempted, or begun, according to the nature of the case or the meaning of the verb. The future with εἰμί and the participle is fairly common. The future optative does not occur in the New Testament. As in the present, so in the future no distinctive expression of aoristic action is made. The very fact of futurity throws an air of indefiniteness over many verbs in the future tense. The will of the speaker or writer often enters largely into the tone and exact force of a verb in the future. Compare our shall and will. The only way to emphasize the idea of incompleteness in the future tense is by the use of εἰμί and the participle as in the present tense. There is this difference, however. In the future the idea is usually aoristic (ἀόριστος, undefined). This is due partly to the nature of the case since all future events are more or less uncertain. But another reason is the origin of the tense itself. It is probably a variation of the aorist subjunctive as the usage of Homer indicates (cf. Giles, *Manual, etc.*, p. 446 ff.). But Giles suggests also that the Aryan and Letto-Slavonic future in *-syo* (cf. "go" in English and NA in Coptic) may be discernible also. But the result is that the future indicative and aorist subjunctive do not differ greatly in actual usage. Hence in the New Testament with ἐάν, ἵνα, μή ποτε, etc., both appear. There is a difference though slight. The subjunctive is a doubtful assertion in present time, while the future indicative is a positive assertion in future time. Some futures indeed are but variations of the present indicative (cf. εἰμί and ἔρχομαι), due to the vivid realization of a future event in present time. See Delbrueck. The periphrastic future is common in the Sanskrit. In the modern Greek θέλω and the infinitive (cf. English) is the most frequent method. In the New Testament θέλω has not yet weakened to a mere future like our "will" and "shall." In a passage like Jo. 7:17 the full force of θέλω is to be insisted on. Cf. θέλετε ἀπολύσω (Matt. 27:17) with modern Greek. Μέλλω appears in the New Testament chiefly with the aorist or present infinitive, (Matt. 11:14; Rom. 8:18) and with future infinitive also (Acts 11:28). Forms like πίομαι (Luke 17:8) give color to the aoristic origin of the future. A case like

ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε (1 Pet. 1:16) has an imperative force. But various as the sources of the future are, it is certain that it is a later development in the tenses. The future with a negative may amount to a prohibition. The future participle is not common in the New Testament (Matt. 27:49). Here are further examples of the New Testament usage: Matt. 1:21 (καλέσεις); 3:11 (βαπτίσει); 6:5 (οὐκ ἔσεσθε); 10:22 (ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι); 12:21 (ἐλπιοῦσιν); 16:22 (ἔσται); 21:41 (ἀπολέσω, cf. ἀπολῶ 1 Cor. 1:19); 27:24 (ὄψεσθε); Lu. 1:20 (ἔσῃ σιωπῶν); 12:8 (ὁμολογήσει); 16:3 (ποιήσω); Phil. 1:18 (χαρήσομαι); Lu. 21:19 (κτήσεσθε); Heb. 11:32 (ἐπιλείψει).

7. Completed action—(present perfect, past perfect, and future perfect). The perfect tense is found in all the modes, although naturally it would not occur often in the subjunctive, optative, and imperative. Indeed in the New Testament the perfect optative is absent and in the subjunctive is found only in the periphrastic form. The perfect imperative is almost obsolete in the New Testament. The κοινή corresponds to this situation. But the perfect infinitive and participle are quite common. It always conveys the same sense, completed action. Variations in the resultant idea will occur in this tense also, owing to the meaning of the verb and the context. The action may have been completed a moment ago or a thousand years ago. The action may be represented as just finished or as standing finished. The tense yields itself naturally to these different applications. The resultant idea may be state or condition. The reduplication is the effort to express the idea of completion in the verb form and exists in all the modes. It depends on the speaker or writer as to how he will present an action, whether as incompleted, completed, or indefinite. He chooses the tense that will present his idea. No sensible man uses one tense when he means another tense. That would be jargon. But in the subjunctive, optative, and imperative the choice is practically one between the aorist and the present. Different writers vary greatly in the use of the aorist and the present. It is true indeed that in Sanskrit, as the aorist disappears, the perfect is used with increasing frequency. In Latin the distinction in form between the aorist and the perfect vanished completely, but the idea of the aorist was

preserved in the perfect form (aorist) as is shown by the sequence of tenses in a dependent clause. One cannot infer, because Greek uses presents, aorists, imperfects, and perfects in parallel clauses, that these tenses are equivalent. The Greek loves variety. The writer or speaker has perfect freedom to change his standpoint and he expects the hearer or reader to do likewise. Uniformity belongs to the professional grammarian, not to the living language. Whatever may be true of the Byzantine Greek under the influence of the Latin blending of aorist and perfect forms (not of tense meaning), that cannot be justly said to be true of the New Testament Greek. There is a threefold history of reduplication in Greek. With the aorist reduplication is intensive as ἤγαγον, with the present continuous as δίδωμι, with the perfect completed in idea as δέδωκα.

(a) The present perfect.

This is the standard tense for completed action and is in all the modes. In the New Testament the perfect optative does not occur, but some examples of the periphrastic subjunctive are found besides εἰδῶ (1 Tim. 3:15). The perfect imperative is rare, though the perfect infinitive and the perfect participle are common. The present perfect is not used for the past perfect, the aorist, the present or the future. For vividness a writer will sometimes use it in the midst of other tenses, but he makes the change on purpose in order to produce vividness. He does not wish the present perfect understood as aorist. The use of εἰμί with the perfect participle is rather common in the New Testament. The present perfect with reduplication is probably derived from the iterative present. We do not know the origin of the -κα stems. The existence of οἶδα, λέλοιπα, etc., may indicate that some reduplicated stems in -κα set the fashion for most perfects. The modern Greek has wholly dropped the reduplicated perfect save in the passive participle. Instead ἔχω and the aorist infinitive (ει, not αι) is used as ἔχω λύσει much like the English. The older Greek has already begun to use ἔχω λύσας. This analytic process is characteristic of the κοινή and so of the New Testament (especially Luke). The present perfect in Greek does not say that

the act was just completed. That may be true or not. Here again the meaning of the verb itself and the context is to be carefully observed (*Aktionsart*). The resultant idea will be due to the tense plus the special verb idea. Each tense thus has a certain amount of play in actual usage, though the tense idea itself remains stable. The idea of completion may thus have immediate application or remote, may accent the permanence of the completion over a long period or merely the present situation, may suggest the unchangeable result or accent only the actual outcome. It is not possible to square the Greek perfect with English usage. For a good discussion of this point see Plummer on Luke, p. 424. The Greeks used the aorist where we in English prefer the perfect and *vice versa*. Each language has its own point of view. These examples will illustrate New Testament usage: Matt. 3:2 (ἤγγικεν); Matt. 25:24 (εἰληφώς, contrast with λαβών verse 20); 4:7 (γέγραπται); 13:46 (πέπρακεν, cf. εἶχεν); Mk. 4:39 (πεφίμωσο); 15:44 (τέθνηκεν); Luke 1:22 (ἑώρακεν); 4:6 (παραδέδοται); 5:23 (ἀφέωνται); 5:32 (ἐλήλυθα); 14:8 (ᾖ κεκλημένος); 14:18 (ἔχε με παρῃτημένον); 16:26 (ἐστήρικται); 20:6 πεπεισμένος ἐστίν); Jo. 5:36 (ἀπέσταλκε); 5:45 (ἠλπίκατε); 16:28 (ἐλήλυθα and note ἐξῆλθον); 17:6 (τετήρηκαν); 19:22 (γέγραφα); 1 Cor. 15:4 (ἐγήγερται); Heb. 5:12 (γεγόνατε ἔχοντες); 7:23 (εἰσὶν γεγονότες); Jas. 1:24 (ἀπελήλυθεν); 2 Cor. 1:9 (πεποιθότες ὦμεν); Rev. 5:7 (εἴληφεν); Mk. 5:4 (δεδέσθαι). Cf. also Mark 5:19 and Luke 12:35.

(b) Past perfect. The augment (the sign of past time) is not always used in the New Testament (see Homer). This tense is not so common as the aorist indicative because it was not so often desired to emphasize completed action in past time. This tense, as all idea of past time, is confined to the indicative. It was never very common in Greek, in simple truth, just as the perfect subjunctive, optative, and imperative never enjoyed a wide vogue. The Boeotian dialect has no past perfect. Still in the κοινή the past perfect indicative is far more in evidence than the perfects in the other modes. For practical purposes outside of the indicative the Greek used the aorist or the present and only occasionally the perfect. In the indicative, future time was almost wholly indicated

by one tense, present time by two tenses, past time by three though the aorist and the imperfect held the field against the past perfect. The aorist was used of past time in the indicative, as a matter of course, unless there was a special desire to lay stress on the incompletion or the completion of the action. When therefore the past perfect is used, the completion in past time is distinctly emphasized. But as a rule the Greeks did not care to work out the relation of time so carefully. The simple aorist told the story consecutively and one could see the rest for himself. The periphrastic form appears occasionally. Examine these New Testament illustrations: Matt. 7:25 (τεθεμελίωτο); 26:43 (ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι); Mark 14:44 (δεδώκει); 16:9 (ἐκβεβλήκει); Luke 4:29 (ᾠκοδόμητο); 5:17 (ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες); 8:29 (συνηρπάκει); 15:24 (ἦν ἀπολωλώς); 16:20 (ἐβέβλητο); Jo. 6:17 (ἐγεγόνει, and note great variety of tenses in verses 16-21); 11:44 (περιεδέδετο); 18:5 (ἱστήκει); Acts 14:23 (πεπιστεύκεισαν); 20:16 (κεκρίκει); 21:29 (ἦσαν προεωρακότες, and note εἰσήγαγεν and κεκοίνωκεν in preceding verse).

(c) The future perfect. This was always a rare tense and is nearly extinct in the New Testament. It is not often necessary to express completed action in future time. The few examples in the New Testament are confined to the indicative. One (κεκράξουσιν) in Lu. 19:40 is not supported by Aleph B L, and is not in Westcott and Hort's text. The other examples are periphrastic futures with εἰμί save εἰδήσω in Heb. 8:11, and this is from the LXX. The two ancient Greek future perfects active (ἑστήξω and τεθνήξω) do not appear in the New Testament. As examples of the periphrastic conjugation observe the following: Matt. 16:19 (ἔσται δεδεμένον); Lu. 12:52 (ἔσονται διαμεμερισμένοι); Heb. 2:13 (ἔσομαι πεποιθώς).

CHAPTER XX.

CO-ORDINATE AND SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. CONJUNCTIONS.

1. What is a sentence? The answer in grammatical terms is not so easy as it appears at first. The word *sententia* is, of course, a thought, an opinion expressed. The object of language is supposed to be to convey thought—or to conceal it. Any word or phrase that conveys a clear and complete idea is a sentence. Is the verb essential to a sentence? Some grammarians think so, but that is not always true. The verb is the main word in a sentence and is usually expressed, but not always. It is not alone the copula ἐστίν that is sometimes absent. Any verb may be absent if the sense is clear without it. When sailors shout "A sail! A sail!" it is a distinct idea.

2. The simple sentence grew up around the verb. Subject and predicate became the foci of the sentence. Each of these might or might not be further amplified by the various parts of speech or by adjuncts. The child is making progress when he puts words together. The clause may be long or short.

3. Co-ordination of clauses is the next step in language. Two clauses are either placed side by side with connecting links (true conjunctions) or contrasted with each other (disjunctive particles). Co-ordination (paratactic conjunctions) was the first and always the most frequent method of uniting clauses. In the New Testament the κοινή usage is perhaps heightened in this particular by the use of καί much like Hebrew *vav*, though not to the extent of the LXX. Καί is as frequent as τέ is uncommon in the New Testament. Τέ is used chiefly in Luke (especially Acts) as Luke 2:16 (τέ—καί), 21:11, etc. Besides τέ—καί it is found alone (Acts 1:15), with δέ (Acts 19:2), and with another τέ (Acts 2:46). But καί in the New Testament is the most frequent of all conjunctions. Turn

to the Gospel of John, for instance, and it meets you at every turn as a mere connective between words (Jo. 3:22), at the beginning of clauses (9:39), equal to and yet (3:19), in the sense of also (10:16). For οὔτε . . . . καί see Jo. 4:11. Another use equivalent to even is found elsewhere (Lu. 10:17). The καὶ ἐγένετο so common in Luke (over fifty times) does look like the Hebrew, but the papyri have it also. The N. T. has four constructions with καὶ ἐγένετο, one is καὶ ἐγένετο καί (Lu. 5:17), another is καὶ ἐγένετο and the verb (1:23) another in καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἰδού (24:4), and the last is the infinitive (Mk. 2:23). So also ἐγένετο δέ (Lu. 6:1). In καὶ ἐγένετο καί, the second καί is almost like ὅτι. Δέ (Jo. 11:4) and ἀλλά (2 Cor. 7:11) are both in themselves co-ordinating conjunctions. For καί . . . . καί see Jo. 6:36. For καὶ γάρ see Jo. 4:23. In Matt. 26:15 καί (κἀγὼ . . . . παραδώσω) almost has the force of ἵνα. Καί can be used any number of times. See Matt. 18:25. The paratactic conjunctions are not always used. Cf. 2 Tim. 3:2 f. (Asyndeton). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:42-44.

4. Contrast is expressed by several conjunctions in frequent use. ἤ is used fairly often both singly and doubly (ἤ—ἤ) as Matt. 5:17; 6:24. So also εἴτε, only in Paul's Epistles (common) and twice in 1 Peter. See 1 Cor. 3:22. δέ is not so frequent as a transitional conjunction between sentences as it was in the earlier Greek. This is due to the wide use of καί and to the frequent absence of transitional conjunctions in the New Testament. Still δέ occurs very often and both as a slight mark of transition and as a rather strong adversative conjunction, depending altogether on the context. See 1 Cor. 15:12, 20. Cf. ἐγὼ δέ (Matt. 5:28). For καὶ δέ see Jo. 6:51. ἀλλά does not in itself mean contrast any more than δέ, but is so used in appropriate contexts (Jo. 6:32). For use in mere progressive statement see 2 Cor. 7:11. For ἀλλά in conclusion of a condition see Rom. 6:5. For ἀλλ' ἤ see 2 Cor. 1:13. μήν occurs only once (Heb. 6:14) and that in a quotation from the Septuagint. ὅμως occurs only three times (John 12:42).

5. Disjunctive conjunctions are ἤ and εἴτε. In Matt. 12:33 we have ἤ . . . . ἤ, but in Lu. 20:4 only one ἤ. For ἤτοι . . . . ἤ see (Rom. 6:16). Green (*Handbook of N. T. Greek Grammar*, p. 345)

cites καί in Matt. 21:23 as practically disjunctive. Cf. Heb. *vav*. For ἤ καί see Rom. 4:9. For εἴτε . . . . εἴτε see Rom. 12:6-8. Negative disjunctives are frequent. So οὐκ . . . . οὐδέ (Acts 8:21) οὐδέ . . . . οὐδέ (Rev. 9:4), οὔτε . . . . οὔτε (Rom. 8:38), οὐδέ . . . . οὔτε (Gal. 1:12), μή . . . . μηδέ (Jo. 4:15), μηδέ . . . . μηδέ (Matt. 10:10). We even have οὔτε . . . . καί (Jo. 4:11).

6. Inferential conjunctions serve also to mark the transition from sentence to sentence as well as from clause to clause. The Greeks carried the idea of inner relation often to all the sentences. So close did they feel the bond of connected thought to be. ἄρα (from ἀραρίσκω) is used fairly often and is usually prepositive in the New Testament, especially with οὖν (Matt. 12:28; Eph. 2:19). οὖν is very common in the Gospel of John (not Epistles and Revelation) and moderately so elsewhere. It is used in both the transitional and illative senses (John 2:18; Matt. 3:10). ἄρα οὖν is common in Paul as Rom. 8:12. γάρ (γέ+ἄρα) is very common indeed in various resultant senses (explanation, argument, etc.) due to its compound etymology, and the various connections in which it occurs. See Acts 8:31; Matt. 1:21; Rom. 2:1; 16:19. Cf. τοιγαροῦν (Heb. 12:1), and τοίνυν (Lu. 20:25). The Greek like the Latin uses the relative like a conjunction and begins a sentence thus. So ἀνθ' ὧν (Lu. 12:3), διό (Rom. 1:24), etc. Cf. ὥστε Matt. 19:6.

7. But the Greek is particularly rich in subordinating conjunctions which introduce dependent clauses. Thus a number of dependent clauses may be grouped around one independent clause, the whole being a highly organized method of speech. The Sanskrit and the Hebrew are both poor in these subordinating conjunctions. But Greek is like Latin and English in this respect. These conjunctions will be discussed in detail in connection with the special forms of sentence that they give rise to. Here a few only are mentioned *en bloc*. ὅτι is freely used both in direct quotations (Matt. 4:6), indirect quotations (Matt. 2:16), and in causal sentences (Lu. 6:20). So with ὡς in comparative clauses, temporal clauses, indirect discourse (how, not "that"). See Lu. 24:6; Rom. 15:24 (ὡς ἄν). ὅτε and ὅταν are used hundreds of times, ὁπότε not at all (WH.), ἐπεί (Heb. 9:26; 10:2; Rom. 3:6) and

ἐπειδή seldom, ἡνίκα twice, ἐστέ not at all, ἕως often, μέχρι and ἄχρι seldom, ὅπου common, οὗ fairly so, ὅθεν moderately often. But the time would fail to tell of all the Greek conjunctions in this space. This list added to those already discussed in subordinate clauses, will give some idea of New Testament usage.

8. Modes, tenses, and voices mean the same thing in both subordinate and independent clauses. The root idea of mode and tense is always discernible. Each will be colored by the meaning of the verb itself and the context, but here again the resultant idea of all these must not be put upon the mode. The Greek is a highly organized language with a rich collection of conjunctions, both co-ordinating and subordinating. It is thus possible in Greek, by means of the sharp distinction in tense, mode, and conjunction to make very exact distinctions in the expression of Greek thought. The imperative is naturally used seldom in subordinate clauses, and in the New Testament very seldom. Note ᾧ ἀντίστητε (1 Pet. 5:9), εἰς ἣν στῆτε in 1 Pet. 5:12, and ἵνα . . . . καυχάσθω (1 Cor. 1:31). The point to insist on is that the subordinating conjunctions do not change the root ideas in mode, voice, and tense. In Matt. 9:31 (ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω) two imperatives come together. In 1 Cor. 1:31 καυχάσθω after ἵνα is due to the quotation.

9. The two kinds of statement natural to subordinate clauses are positive assertion and doubting assertion. The indicative, of course, is used for the one, and the subjunctive and the optative for the other. In the New Testament the subjunctive is nearly always used for the second idea. The infinitive and participle are also freely used in subordinate clauses, not with conjunctions, however, as they are not really modes. Often an idea in Greek can be expressed with substantial identity either by a conjunction and a finite mode, or by the infinitive with or without a preposition, or by the participle. Individual style and taste will often determine between them as well as between several conjunctions of similar import. All subordinate clauses maintain a case relation to the principal part of the sentence, and so are either substantive, adjective, or adverbial. See Matt. 9:28 where the clause with ὅτι is in the accusative case and is substantive. The relative clause is

an adjective clause (Lu. 1:26) as the temporal clause is an adverbial clause (Lu. 1:23).

10. So close did the Greeks feel the connection of thought to be that independent sentences were often, almost usually in the more careful writers, joined together by some of the co-ordinating conjunctions or intensive particles. In Plato or Demosthenes such sentences and even paragraphs are thrown into relief or relation to each other by δέ, καί, ἀλλά, τε, οὐδέ, γάρ, οὖν, ἄρα, ἤ, δή, etc. As mentioned above even relative pronouns (cf. ὅθεν Heb. 8:3) with prepositions were so used as ἐν οἷς, οὗ χάριν (Lu. 7:47), δι' ἣν αἰτίαν (2 Tim. 1:12), etc. But in the New Testament this inner bond is not so constantly preserved. In Romans, for instance, where the line of thought is close, Paul constantly follows the ancient idiom. But in the Gospels frequent breaks occur as in Jo. 13:21,22,23,24, 25, but in 26 we find οὖν. Καί is perhaps rather more frequently used at the beginning of sentences than in the earlier Greek. Cf. Jo. 13:27.

CHAPTER XXI.

FINAL CLAUSES.

1. Pure final clauses are adverbial, and are in fact in the accusative case (general reference). Compare the adverb δωρεάν. Here there is design, something aimed at, finis, end, aim.

2. In the New Testament the pure final particles are ἵνα, ὅπως, μή. ὡς occurs once (Acts 20:24) according to some documents. So Westcott and Hort. ἵνα is far the most common particle of design and is used chiefly with the subjunctive, but often with the future indicative, and even a few times with the present indicative. Seek the force of mode, voice, and tense in each instance. As illustrations of these particles take Mk. 9:9 (ἵνα μηδενὶ διηγήσωνται); Lu. 6:34 (ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν); 20:10 (ἵνα δώσουσιν); 1 Jo. 5:20 (ἵνα γινώσκομεν). In the case of ὅπως only the subjunctive is used in the text of W H except once (Rom. 3:4 with ἄν), and usually without ἄν as in Matt. 6:2 (ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν), negative μή (Matt. 6:18, ὅπως μὴ φανῇς), but occasionally with ἄν as in Luke 2:35 (ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν). The old classic construction of ὅπως and the future indicative with verbs of effort has disappeared in the New Testament. In Rom. 3:4 ὅπως νικήσεις is from the LXX. Ὅπως in Lu. 24:20 (ὅπως παρέδωκαν) is relative merely and not final. μή, μήποτε, and μήπως are used for pure design and so adverbial. The subjunctive or future indicative can be used. So Mk. 13:36 (μὴ εὕρῃ); 14:2 (μήποτε ἔσται); 1 Cor. 9:27 (μήπως γένωμαι). μήπως is also used with the aorist indicative to express a design about a past event. So Gal. 2:2 (μήπως ἔδραμον) and 1 Thess. 3:5 (μήπως ἐπείρασεν). In 2 Tim. 2:25 W H have in the text μήποτε δῴη (opt.) after primary tense.

3. ἵνα is not always strictly final. It is in the New Testament very often non-final, not result, but not yet design. In this con-

struction the clause is substantive and gives the content and not the purpose. The clause will then be substantive and in the nominative, accusative, or some other case. In modern Greek *νά* and finite mode has supplanted the infinitive. This tendency is perceptible in the New Testament. The negative is *μή*. The possible optative in Eph. 1:17 (*δῴη*) is not pure design. Both here and in 2 Tim. 2:25 the optative in text of W H is after primary tense. It may seem strange that this non-final or sub-final use of *ἵνα* did not come to be pure result since the Latin *ut* (cf. English that) was used in both senses. But as a matter of fact it did not. *Ὅπως* is also sometimes employed in the non-final and substantive sense. The same thing is also true of *μή*, *μήποτε*, *μήπως*, especially after verbs of beseeching, striving, fearing, etc., and in the accusative. *μή* in the best documents is found only with the subjunctive in New Testament, as Acts 27:17 (*μὴ ἐκπέσωσιν*). *μήποτε* is little used in this sense, but is found with subjunctive and future indicative as in Heb. 4:1 (*μήποτε δοκῇ*); 3:12 (*μήποτε ἔσται*). *ποτὲ* has lost its temporal idea and means "perchance." *μήπως* is used with the subjunctive as 1 Cor. 8:9 (*μήπως γένηται*). If the fear or caution is about a present or past event, the indicative is used with *μήπως*. So Gal. 4:11 (*μήπως κεκοπίακα*). With the infinitive *φοβοῦμαι* means to hesitate (Matt. 2:22, *ἐφοβήθη ἀπελθεῖν*). In Lu. 19:21 we have *ὅτι . . . . εἶ* after *ἐφοβούμην σε*. Here are further examples of *ἵνα* with the non-final idea: Mk. 8:22 (*ἵνα ἅψηται* after *παρακαλοῦσιν*); Matt. 18:6 (*συμφέρει ἵνα κρεμασθῇ*); Mk. 9:30 (*οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ*); Jo. 15:12 f. (*ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε* in apposition with *ἐντολή*, *ἵνα θῇ* in apposition with *ταύτης*). A peculiar use of *ἵνα* with the imperative in 1 Cor. 1:31 (*ἵνα καυχάσθω*) is due to the direct quotation without change of form. John's Gospel has *ἵνα* about one hundred and fifty times while Luke has only sixteen instances of it in Acts.

4. There are other methods of expressing design in the New Testament besides conjunctions. The infinitive is very commonly used for this purpose and never expresses mere result, not even Rom. 7:3 (*τοῦ μὴ εἶναι*); either by itself as accusative of general reference, Mark 2:17 (*καλέσαι*); or with the very common *τοῦ* (genitive of the article, and not our English to) as Matt. 2:13 (*τοῦ ἀπο-*

λέσαι); or with εἰς τό (often in Paul), as Rom. 1:11 (εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι); or with πρὸς τό (common in Luke and Paul), as Matt. 23:5 πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι); or with ὥστε as Matt. 24:24 (ὥστε πλανᾶσθαι); or with ὡς (twice only), as Heb. 7:9 (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν). Moreover, the relative with the future indicative, Mark 1:2 (ὃς κατασκευάσει) or the subjunctive, Heb. 8:3 (ὃ προσενέγκῃ), can be used to indicate design. A few examples of the future participle also occur, as Acts 8:27 (προσκυνήσων).

5. Sometimes the principal verb is not expressed and the context must supply the leading idea as only the dependent clause is given. This is natural in abrupt speech. So Mk. 5:23 (ἵνα ἐπιθῇς); Matt. 20:32 (ἵνα ἀνοιγῶσιν); Eph. 4:29 (ἵνα δῷ).

6. Then again ἵνα itself is not used in what is like a non-final clause. However these examples can be otherwise and more properly explained than by the ellipsis of ἵνα. Each verb may be independent and the subjunctive merely the hortatory subjunctive or a question of doubt. So Lu. 6:42 (ἄφες ἐκβάλω; compare the modern Greek ἂς and subjunctive regularly); Jo. 18:39 (βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω); Mk. 14:12 (θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν).

CHAPTER XXII.

CLAUSES OF RESULT.

1. Consecutive clauses had a meager development in Greek as compared with Latin and modern English. After all result was once design and design may be contemplated result. So *ut* in Latin serves both purposes. Blass (*Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 272) thinks that ἵνα came to be so used in the New Testament. But to this we demur.

2. In the ancient Greek the consecutive idea was expressed by ὥστε and the indicative when it was regarded as actually accomplished. There are only two examples of this use of ὥστε in the New Testament, John 3:16 (ὥστε ἔδωκεν), and Gal. 2:13 (ὥστε συναπήχθη). The indicative suits these two cases exactly.

3. But in the New Testament the infinitive with ὥστε is very common, not merely in the sense of design, the old usage (Luke 4:29, ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι), but also of actual result (Mark 4:37 ὥστε γεμίζεσθαι). Cf. Matt. 13:32 (ὥστε ἐλθεῖν). This latter is indeed the usual construction of ὥστε in the New Testament, some forty-five examples in all.

4. The word ὥστε is also used at the beginning of sentences with the indicative, the subjunctive, or even the imperative. But here it has no effect on the construction at all and is not a consecutive particle, but an inferential conjunction. See Mk. 2:28 (ὥστε ἐστίν); 1 Cor. 5:8 (ὥστε ἑορτάζωμεν); 1 Cor. 10:12 (ὥστε βλεπέτω).

5. The origin of ὥστε is very simple, ὡς and τέ. ὡς was originally a demonstrative (ὅς in Homer) and then a relative. It is not always easy to decide which ὥστε is with the infinitive, demonstrative, or relative, nor does it greatly matter in actual usage.

6. Perhaps a word more is needed to observe that not only is ἵνα not used in the strict consecutive sense, but the infinitive is not

so used except with ὥστε. No true example of τοῦ and the infinitive in this sense exists in the New Testament, nor of εἰς τό and infinitive, not to mention πρὸς τό and the infinitive. See on the other side Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 157.

7. Ἐφ' ᾧτε (on condition that) does not appear in the New Testament at all nor ὥς τε after ἤ. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 224) thinks that ἵνα in Gal. 2:9 is practically equal to ἐφ' ᾧτε.

8. In Heb. 3:11; 4:3 ὡς is considered consecutive by some scholars (so), but "as" is probably correct.

9. In Matt. 8:27 ὅτι is practically a resultant conjunction after οὗτος. Cf. *qui* in Latin. Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν; cf. also Lu. 8:25. This is much like οὕτως ὥστε.

10. Burton (*N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 124) says that New Testament Greek uses the relative with the idea of result as in Latin and the older Greek, but he cites no example to that effect. In Rom. 8:32 ὅς γε with ἐφείσατο comes close to that idea.

CHAPTER XXIII.

WISHES.

1. It is not the verbs that express wish or will that are here under discussion though they have an interest in themselves. Cf. Matt. 1:19 (ἐβουλήθη for deliberate choice) and Matt. 2:18 (ἤθελεν for inclination). It is how the New Testament Greek expresses a wish that we have to consider.

2. The old Greek usage of εἴθε and εἰ γάρ has vanished. Instead is found ὄφελον (ὤφελον without augment) used as a particle like *utinam* in Latin. Cf. already ἄφες with subjunctive above.

3. So then a wish about the past is put in the aorist indicative with ὄφελον as in 1 Cor. 4:8 (ὄφελον ἐβασιλεύσατε).

4. A wish about the present is expressed by the imperfect indicative and ὄφελον. So Rev. 3:15 (ὄφελον ἦς). Cf. also 2 Cor. 11:1. In Rev. 3:15 some MSS. actually have ὄφελον εἶης.

5. A wish about the future may also be expressed by ὄφελον and the future indicative as we have it once in Gal. 5:12 (ὄφελον ἀποκόψονται). But the usual way to express a future wish in New Testament Greek is still the optative, once the present as in Acts 8:20 (εἴη), usually the aorist as in 1 Thess. 5:23 (ἁγιάσαι). The commonest wish of this kind is μὴ γένοιτο (Gal. 6:14).

6. The wish about the future may verge on the border of a command or prohibition as in Mk. 11:14 (μηκέτι φάγοι, the only optative in Mark). On the other hand the imperative in imprecations is close to a wish as in Gal. 1:9 (ἀνάθεμα ἔστω).

7. In Acts 26:29 (εὐξαίμην ἄν) we have the apodosis of a fourth class condition, the so-called potential optative, a very polite form of expression. This is in harmony with classic diction.

8. The imperfect tense with the verb of wishing offers another polite and courteous way of saying a difficult thing. It is just the

imperfect without *ἄν* with no suggestion of a condition at all. The present indicative would be too blunt. So *ἐβουλόμην* (Acts 25:22), *ἤθελον* (Gal. 4:20), *ηὐχόμην* (Rom. 9:3). As examples of *θέλω* take Matt. 20:14; Rom. 1:13, and of *βούλομαι* 1 Tim. 2:8.

CHAPTER XXIV.

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

1. The common particle γάρ is used in co-ordinate, not subordinate, clauses. In sense it is often causal, but it is not considered a causal conjunction in the formal usage.

2. The usual causal conjunction is ὅτι and in some writers (James, 1 Pet., Heb.) διότι. The subjunctive mode is not used nor the optative. The indicative has its usual force. The negative is always οὐ as in 1 Jo. 5:10 (ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν) except in one instance (Jo. 3:18) where the construction is closely parallel to the above (ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν). The distinction is exactly that between οὐ and μή and it is a real one. Sometimes the causal connection is not very close and not very different from γάρ. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:17 (both ὅτι and γάρ) and Rom. 1:21 (διότι). For a closer link see 1 Cor. 11:2 (ὅτι) and Lu. 1:13 (διότι).

3. Ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, and ἐπειδήπερ are all found in the New Testament. But ἐπειδήπερ appears only in Luke's classical introduction to his Gospel (1:1), while ἐπειδή is found some nine times in this sense (1 Cor. 1:22, ἐπειδὴ αἰτοῦσιν). Ἐπεί is still more frequent in the usual causal sense (as Heb. 5:2, ἐπεὶ περίκειται). The classical usage of an ellipsis with ἐπεί persists in the New Testament also where ἐπεί=since if that were true. So Heb. 9:26 (ἐπεὶ ἔδει); 10:2 (ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο). Once the negative with ἐπεί is μή as in Heb. 9:17 (ἐπεὶ μὴ τότε ἰσχύει).

4. In Matt. 25:40,45 ἐφ' ὅσον is causal, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε. Note also καθ' ὅσον in Heb. 7:20.

5. Καθότι, though a comparative particle as in Acts 4:35 (καθότι ἂν εἶχεν), is yet in Luke used also as a causal conjunction. So Lu. 19:9 (καθότι ἐστίν). In Heb. (as ὅθεν ὤφειλεν, 3:1) ὅθεν occurs some half dozen times.

6. The infinitive with διά is often used in the New Testament to express a reason. See Luke 2:4 (διὰ τὸ εἶναι). Cf. Mk. 5:4. In Jo. 2:24 we have διὰ τό and ὅτι in verse 25.

7. The participle likewise is used where the causal idea is implied. So Matt. 1:19 (δίκαιος ὤν). Usually in such cases the particle ὡς is added to give the alleged reason, which may or may not be the true one. So Lu. 16:1 (ὡς διασκορπίζων); Acts 27:30 (ὡς μελλόντων). So also ὥσπερ in Acts 2:2 (ὥσπερ φερομένης).

8. The relative pronoun may imply a cause. So Heb. 12:6 (ὃν παραδέχεται). So often ὅστις as in Matt. 7:15 (οἵτινες ἔρχονται); Rom. 6:2 (οἵτινες).

9. Ἀνθ' ὧν (Lu. 1:20) and διό (Heb. 3:10) almost amount to causal conjunctions. Cf. also οὗ χάριν, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, etc. In Heb. 2:18 ἐν ᾧ is practically causal.

CHAPTER XXV.

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

1. Some general remarks. The Greek conditional sentence is one of the crowning triumphs of syntax. No language has surpassed it in accuracy of expression. In the modern Greek the loss of the optative is felt, and the system generally has suffered collapse, as is the case in modern English. The important things to understand in a Greek condition are the mode and tense. Historical syntax does not justify the modern distinction into general and particular conditions. There are four separate forms for Greek conditions (Winer, Broadus, Blass). They are the condition determined as fulfilled, the condition determined as unfulfilled, the condition undetermined but with prospect of fulfilment, the condition undetermined and with remote prospect of fulfilment. Let us first see the standard forms. Then we can study the variations.

2. The condition determined as fulfilled. Here any tense of the indicative is used in the condition, and any tense of the indicative in the conclusion. The indicative *states* the condition as a fact. It may or may not be true in fact. The *condition* has nothing to do with that, but only with the *statement*. It is here that Hadley and Allen chiefly err. This condition does *assume* the reality of the condition. Take Matt. 12:27. Christ did not cast out demons by Beelzebub, but in argument he assumes it. The indicative mode determines the condition as fulfilled, so far as the statement is concerned. εἰ is used in the condition clause as a rule, though sometimes ἐάν occurs with the present indicative and often with the future. In Homer ἐάν (or εἴ κε) is used freely with indicative or subjunctive as in the modern Greek. Sometimes the apodosis is not in the indicative at all, but in the imperative or the hortatory

subjunctive. But this variation is so slight as not to change the essential nature of the condition. This is far the most common condition. It is the natural one to use, unless there is a special reason to use another. It is the condition taken at its face value without any insinuations or implications. The context, of course, must determine the actual situation. The protasis often comes first. Some representative examples are here given: Matt. 12:27 (εἰ ἐκβάλλω, ἐκβάλλουσιν); 12:28 (εἰ ἐκβάλλω, ἔφθασεν); 26:33 (εἰ σκανδαλισθήσονται, σκανδαλισθήσομαι); Lu. 4:3 (εἰ εἶ, εἰπέ); 19:40 (ἐὰν σιωπήσουσιν, κράξουσιν); Jo. 15:20 (εἰ ἐδίωξαν, διώξουσιν); 18:23 (εἰ ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον); Acts 11:17 (εἰ ἔδωκεν, τίς ἤμην); 1 Thess. 3:8 (ζῶμεν ἐὰν στήκετε); 1 Cor. 15:16 (εἰ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, ἐγήγερται). These examples will exhibit the freedom and variety shown in this most common condition usually termed the condition of the first class.

3. The condition determined as unfulfilled. Here only past tenses of the indicative are used with εἰ in the condition and generally ἄν in the conclusion. This condition *states* the condition as untrue, as contrary to fact. It may be fact, but it is here treated as not fact. Here again it is the statement only that is contrary to reality. Take Luke 7:39 where the Pharisee assumes that Jesus is not a prophet and hence does not know. The indicative mode determines the condition, and as unfulfilled by suggestion. A present matter is looked at from the standpoint of the past (imperfect indicative), while a past event is looked at from a remoter standpoint (aorist or past perfect indicative). Sometimes this point of view, together with the context, is sufficient to make clear this condition without ἄν in the conclusion. So Jo. 15:22 (εἰ μὴ ἦλθον, οὐκ εἴχοσαν). Note νῦν δέ following by way of contrast. Cf. also the same construction in verse 24. In particular, verbs of fitness, propriety, possibility, and obligation do not need ἄν (not omitted, simply not needed). So Matt. 26:24 (καλὸν ἦν εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη); Acts 26:32 (ἐδύνατο εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο). So also the apodosis ἔδει in Matt. 23:23 and οὐ καθῆκεν in Acts 22:22. Usually, however, ἄν is expressed in the conclusion to make more clear the idea of unreality (the definite use of ἄν). Indicative conditions would naturally be taken as being of the first class, unless there is something

in the context to show otherwise. The presence of ἄν in the apodosis came to be accepted as hint enough. But, as seen above, this hint was not always considered necessary. The context and common sense were often relied on as sufficient. It is only in past time, however, that any question arises between conditions of the first and second classes. Both, according to the genius of the indicative, make positive assumptions, one as true, the other as untrue. Neither goes into the actual facts of the case. That, to be sure, has to be left to the nature of the case. Modern Greek has lost this idiom. Cf. English ambiguity. The ἄν in the apodosis cannot begin the clause. The New Testament has a number of clear examples of this form of the condition, that of the second class: Matt. 11:21 (εἰ ἐγένοντο, πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν); 23:30 (εἰ ἤμεθα, οὐκ ἂν ἤμεθα); 24:43 (εἰ ᾔδει, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴασεν; observe repetition of ἄν as in Lu. 17:6); Lu. 7:39 (εἰ ἦν, ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν); 12:39 (εἰ ᾔδει, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν; margin in WH. has οὐκ ἄν like Matt. 24:43); Jo. 14:28 (εἰ ἠγαπᾶτε, ἐχάρητε ἄν); 18:30 (εἰ μὴ ἦν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἂν παρεδώκαμεν); 19:11 (οὐκ εἶχες, εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον); Acts 18:14 (εἰ μὲν ἦν, κατὰ λόγον ἂν ἀνεσχόμην; and contrast with the next verse, εἰ δέ ἐστιν, ὄψεσθε); Heb. 11:15 (εἰ ἐμνημόνευον, εἶχον ἄν, this about past time); 1 Jo. 2:19 (εἰ ἦσαν, μεμενήκεισαν ἄν).

4. The condition undetermined with some expectation that it will be determined. Here the subjunctive is naturally used in the condition as the more vivid of the two modes of doubtful assertion. ἐάν is used in the condition and sometimes ἄν or εἰ. The conclusion most naturally has the future indicative, but that is not necessary. There is considerable variety in the form of the conclusion. In point of fact any tense of the indicative, subjunctive, or imperative may be here employed. The use of the optative would make a mixed condition which will be discussed later. It all depends on the idea in the speaker's mind and his point of view. The so-called present general condition really belongs here. The subjunctive mode (undetermined) thus clearly marks it off from the two conditions with the indicative (determined). As can be readily seen, the line of cleavage between this condition and the first condition when it has the future indicative is not very sharply

drawn. Goodwin indeed rubs it out entirely. But it is best not to do that. The difference, as already remarked, between the subjunctive and the future indicative is not great, though it is real. Sometimes, though not often, ἐάν is contracted into ἄν after the fashion of the older Greek. So in Jo. 16:23 (ἄν τι αἰτήσητε, δώσει). Further examples follow of the third class condition: Matt. 5:13 (ἐὰν μωρανθῇ, ἁλισθήσεται); 18:13 (ἐὰν γένηται, λέγω); 18:15 (ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ, ἐκέρδησας); Mk. 3:24 (ἐὰν μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται); Lu. 9:13 (οὐκ εἰσίν, εἰ μήτι ἀγοράσωμεν); Jo. 7:17 (ἐὰν θέλῃ, γνώσεται); 7:37 (ἐὰν διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω); 8:51 (ἐὰν τηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ); 12:32 (ἂν ὑψωθῶ, ἑλκύσω); 13:17 (εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά; note both conditions and the distinction); Acts 5:38 (ἐὰν ᾖ, καταλυθήσεται; contrast with εἰ ἐστίν, οὐ δυνήσεσθε in the next verse); 1 Cor. 7:28 (ἐὰν γήμῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες); 2 Cor. 5:1 (ἐὰν καταλυθῇ, ἔχομεν). So also compare εἴ τις καλεῖ (1 Cor. 10:27) with ἐάν τις εἴπῃ (1 Cor. 10:28); Phil. 3:12 (εἰ καταλάβω). In Mk. 10:30 ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ is unusual after οὐδείς ὅς. See Jo. 5:19 for two uses of ἄν.

5. The condition is undetermined and with no indication as to determination. Naturally the optative is here used as the least vivid of the two modes of doubtful statement. Note also the optative in both condition and conclusion. Both of the undetermined conditions are thus marked off by mode (subjunctive and optative) from the two determined conditions (indicative mode). εἰ is used in the condition and ἄν in the conclusion (less definite use of ἄν). In English translation it is difficult to distinguish this form of condition from the second class condition as described above (under 3). But the two conditions differ radically in Greek after Homer's time. In the New Testament no whole example of this class of conditions occurs. We have the condition or the conclusion, but not both at the same time. Already, then, this condition was beginning to break down. In modern Greek it is gone. The so-called past general supposition belonged here with a mixed conclusion. But this construction is not in the New Testament. All that we have left then in the New Testament are some protases by themselves and some apodoses by themselves. The optative is also found in a mixed condition like Acts 8:31 (πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην

ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσει με). This condition was even quite common in literary Greek, as it lent itself readily to polite expression. But it never had a firm hold on the popular tongue. The other three conditions really answer for ordinary use, though without this precise shade of thought. Here are a few New Testament specimens of the fourth class condition: Acts 24:19 is a mixed condition like Acts 8:31, but not of the same kind (οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν, εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρός με). In Acts 27:39 (εἰ δύναιντο) there is a touch of indirect discourse like Acts 17:27 (εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν). See also Acts 17:18 (τί ἂν θέλοι) an apodosis of the fourth class with which compare Lu. 9:46 (τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη) which is not due to indirect discourse. In Acts 26:29 (εὐξαίμην ἄν) the usual apodosis appears. The protasis is found in 1 Pet. 3:14 (εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε), 3:17 (εἰ θέλοι), and 1 Cor. 15:37 (εἰ τύχοι).

6. Mixed conditions. In a language as flexible as the Greek it could not be expected that everything should remain hard and fast. The variations in the structure of conditional sentences are not even all of them peculiar to the Greek genius. Many of them belong to the play of the human mind. It is obviously natural for one point of view to be occupied in the condition and another in the conclusion (1 Cor. 7:28, ἐὰν γήμῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες). This leads to what are called mixed conditions. The grammatical construction is merely accommodated, as always, to the mental conception. All that is involved in a mixed condition is that one form is used in the protasis and another in the conclusion. In the development of the four normal classes of conditions, it would be strange if some interplay were not found. The human mind does not work in ironclad forms. If we recognize the fact of life in language, what are called mixed conditions will give no serious trouble. In Acts 8:31 (see above) we have a protasis of the first class and an apodosis of the fourth. So in Acts 24:19 we find a protasis of the fourth and an apodosis of the second class. In John 8:39 in the marginal reading we have a protasis of the first class and an apodosis of the second (εἰ ἐστέ, ἐποιεῖτε). A clear case of this is found in Lu. 17:6 (εἰ ἔχετε, ἐλέγετε ἄν).

7. The participle may be used instead of a fully expressed con-

dition. The participle does not in itself mean condition, but it may suggest it. So Lu. 19:23 (*κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν αὐτὸ ἔπραξα*). Here a conclusion of the second class is expressed and the participle conceals or implies the condition. So also *λαμβανόμενον* (1 Tim. 4:4) suggests a condition of either the first or the third class.

8. Elliptical conditions. An incomplete condition is really a species of ellipsis, or even aposiopesis, and is common to all languages. So Acts 26:29 (*εὐξαίμην ἄν*, only apodosis); 23:9 (*εἰ ἐλάλησεν*, only protasis). Thus is to be explained also the abrupt use of *εἰ* (compare Hebrew *'im*) in solemn oaths or other strong expressions and questions. So Mk. 8:12 (*εἰ δοθήσεται*); Heb. 3:11 (*εἰ εἰσελεύσονται*). Here *εἰ* does not mean "not" though that is the resultant idea. It is an ellipse also when *εἰ* is used in direct questions as in Lu. 13:23 (*εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι*). Cf. also Luke 22:49. The omission of the verb is a common ellipsis as in Rom. 8:17 (*εἰ δὲ τέκνα*). So also the New Testament uses various expressions without the verb as *εἰ μή* (Matt. 5:13); *εἰ δὲ μή* (*μήγε*), as Mark 2:22; *εἰ μή τι ἄν* (1 Cor. 7:5); even *ἐκτὸς εἰ μή* (1 Tim. 5:19); *ὡσεί* (Matt. 3:16); once *ὡσπερεί* (1 Cor. 15:8); and once *εἴπερ* (Rom. 3:30). Here of course the verb of the condition is not expressed; but even when it is a set phrase, it is still a condition. See John 14:2, where the conclusion occurs (*εἶπον ἄν*). With *ἐπεί* there is sometimes a suppressed condition, the apodosis being expressed. So *ἔδει* in Heb. 9:26 and *οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο* (10:2).

9. A kind of condition worth noticing is one where the influence of indirect discourse is felt. So Rom. 1:10 (*εἴ πως εὐοδωθήσομαι*); Acts 20:16 (*εἰ εἴη*); 27:39 (*εἰ δύναιντο*). With verbs of wonder as in Mark 15:44 (*εἰ τέθνηκεν*) we meet the same phenomenon. In the same passage in Mark observe also *εἰ ἀπέθανεν* (difference in tense).

10. Concessive clauses are nothing but conditional sentences. *Καί* before *εἰ* or *ἐάν* has the force of *even*, and the condition would be "even if." This construction is not common in the New Testament. See John 8:16 (*καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω*). In *εἰ καί* or *ἐάν καί* the *καί* seems more nearly to have the idea of "also;" "if also" then would be a concession not so extreme as "even if." So 2 Cor. 7:8 (*εἰ καὶ*

ἐλύπησα). καίπερ occurs only five times in the New Testament and with the participle each time. But Justin Martyr has καίπερ ὀφείλετε in the First Apology. In Luke 12:38 we find κἂν . . . . κἂν. So Heb. 5:8 (καίπερ ὤν). The correct text of Rev. 17:8 (παρέσται) removes the old καίπερ and the indicative.

11. The negative of the condition clause with the subjunctive is always μή (Lu. 13:3). With the indicative, however, either μή or οὐ is used, but not in the same sense. μή negatives rather the condition itself and in the New Testament the conclusion is nearly always negative also. So John 18:30 (εἰ μὴ ἦν). When οὐ is used in the condition, the negative is quite emphatic or there is antithesis or a single word is negatived. So Lu. 18:4 (εἰ οὐ φοβοῦμαι); Jo. 1:25 (εἰ οὐκ εἶ); 5:47 (εἰ οὐ πιστεύετε); 10:37 (εἰ οὐ ποιῶ, with which compare εἰ ποιῶ just below and κἂν μὴ πιστεύητε). In Matt. 26:42 both οὐ and μή occur in the same sentence (εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ πίω). In 1 Cor. 9:2 εἰ οὐ does not mean precisely what εἰ μή would.

CHAPTER XXVI.

RELATIVE CLAUSES.

1. The relative pronoun relates two clauses by connecting a word in one clause with one in another. Compare Chapter XIII, 11, for brief discussion of the function of the relative pronoun. The relative pronoun not only obviates the repetition of the noun, but binds together two clauses into one sentence.

2. There are two kinds of relative clauses, the adjectival and the adverbial, just as there are two kinds of relative pronouns. Compare ὅς and ὡς. Every relative clause is therefore either an adjective or an adverb. But like other adjectives the relative clause may be used as a substantive. Cf. Jo. 11:3.

3. The relative adverbs may be either local as ὅπου, comparative like ὡς, temporal as ὅτε, final as ὅπως, causal or objective as ὅτι. Just as adjectives are sometimes used as substantives like τὸ ἀγαθόν, so ὅτι in indirect discourse introduces an object clause. Compare *quod* in Latin and even *quia* in late Latin like the Vulgate. It is therefore by means of the relative that Greek and Latin become so rich in subordinate clauses as compared with the Sanskrit, for instance.

4. The mode in the relative clause has just the same force that it has in the independent clause. As a matter of fact in the adjectival relative clauses only the indicative and subjunctive are used in the New Testament. Take as illustrations ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν (Mk. 9:38) and δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν (Heb. 12:28). It is not the relative clause that requires in itself either the indicative or subjunctive.

5. The relative pronoun may be either definite or indefinite as is well illustrated by ὅστις freely used in the New Testament in the nominative either as more definite than ὅς (ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται

αὐτῆς, Lu. 10:42) or less definite than ὅς (ὅστις σὲ ῥαπίζει, Matt. 5:39). So then the indicative, the mode of clear cut statement, may be used either with the definite or the indefinite relative. So likewise with the subjunctive the mode of doubtful assertion. Instance δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν (Heb. 12:28) and ὅστις γὰρ ὅλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ (James 2:10). Cf. ὅπου . . . . φάγω (Lu. 22:11). With ὃ προσενέγκῃ (Heb. 8:3) compare ὃ προσφέρει (Heb. 9:7). This subjunctive is in a clause of design.

6. The grammars commonly speak of the conditional relative sentence, but I doubt the justice of this expression. It is true indeed that ὅστις and εἴτις do not differ greatly in idea. Cf. variations in MSS. on Mk. 8:34 between ὅστις and εἴτις. But after all there is a subtle difference in structure just as between the English "if any one" and "whoever." Technically one is conditional and the other is relative. It is syntactical confusion to blend them just as it would be to call ὁ λαμβάνων (John 13:20) the same thing as ὅς λαμβάνει. Hence ἄν τινα πέμψω (Jo. 13:20) is a conditional clause, but ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει (Mk. 8:35) is a relative clause. The indefinite relative clause whether with indicative or subjunctive is much kin in idea to the conditional sentence, but formally it is still the relative sentence. There is no "if" in the Greek clause any more than in the English. The use of ἄν with ὅς and the future indicative (cf. Lu. 12:8) is indeed like ἐάν and the future indicative.

7. The use of ἄν in the relative clause does not make it a condition. The use of ἄν indeed is much like that of the relative ὅστις. It has the effect of making the clause more definite as (cf. ὅταν ἤνοιξεν, Rev. 8:1) ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο (Mk. 6:56), or the clause is rendered more indefinite as ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ (Matt. 5:22). So ἥτις ἂν μὴ ἀκούσῃ (Acts 3:23). The form ἐάν or ἄν is immaterial as ὃς γὰρ ἐάν θέλῃ and ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ (Mk. 8:35). But ἄν is not necessary with the subjunctive in such relative clauses as is seen in James 2:10 (ὅστις τηρήσῃ). Cf. also ὅστις ἀρνήσηται (Matt. 10:33). Besides ἄν is very common with the indicative, especially the future as ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει (Mk. 8:35), and the past indicative as ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο (Mk. 6:56) and even the present indicative as ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει (Rev. 14:4). Cf. also Lu. 17:33. In Jo. 14:13 see ὅτι ἄν, but ἐάν τι in 14:14.

8. The negative of the relative clause is μή with the subjunctive as ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ (Lu. 8:18) and usually οὐ with the indicative as ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ὑμῶν (Lu. 9:50). But when the relative is indefinite μή may be found as ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ (1 Jo. 4:3) and ἃ μὴ δεῖ (Titus 1:11). In 2 Pet. 1:9 the relative is definite, but the subjective negative suits well, ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα.

9. Sometimes the relative is nearly equivalent to the Latin *qui* with the subjunctive (design or result). So ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ τοῦτο (Lu. 7:4) is practically result with which Blass (*Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 218) compares ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω (Jo. 1:27). See also ὃς κατασκευάσει (Lu. 7:27) as a clause of purpose. Blass also cites (Mk. 14:14) ὅπου φάγω and οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παραθήσω (Lu. 11:6) and οὐδένα ἔχω ὅστις μεριμνήσει (Phil. 2:20). The classic idiom οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὅς (Mk. 10:29) has no effect on the mode. The subjunctive is used also with such clauses of design as δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν (Heb. 12:28).

10. Ὅσος, like ὅς and ὅστις, uses either ἐάν (as ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε, Matt. 7:12) or ἄν (as ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε, Matt. 21:22).

CHAPTER XXVII.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

1. The New Testament has quite a number of temporal conjunctions such as ἄχρι, ἐπεί, ἐπάν, ἐπειδή, ἕως, ἡνίκα, μέχρι, ὁπότε, ὅτε, ὅταν, πρίν, ὡς. These will need to be discussed separately for the most part, but they can be grouped for convenience.

2. One group can be made of ἄχρι, ἕως, μέχρι, and πρίν in the sense of "until," though even here a distinction has to be made and the words can best be treated separately.

(a) Ἄχρι (so always in New Testament save twice ἄχρις, Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 3:13) is both a preposition as in ἄχρι καιροῦ (Lu. 4:13) and less often a conjunction as in ἄχρι τελεσθῇ (Rev. 20:3). The simple conjunction is not so common as is ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας (Matt. 24:38) and ἄχρι οὗ (Lu. 21:24). When an actual historical event is recorded, a past tense of the indicative is used as ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε (Lu. 17:27) and ἄχρι οὗ ἀνέστη (Acts 7:18). The present indicative can also be used of a present situation as in ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται (Heb. 3:13). If the matter is still in the future the subjunctive aorist commonly occurs as in ἄχρι οὗ θῇ (1 Cor. 15:25) and once with ἄν as in ἄχρις ἂν ἔλθῃ (Gal. 3:19). But the future indicative can be employed (ἄχρι τελεσθήσονται, Rev. 17:17) and once with ἄν (ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ᾖξω, Rev. 2:25).

(b) Ἕως likewise is more common as a preposition (ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matt. 1:17) than as a conjunction. As a conjunction we have ἕως (Matt. 2:9), ἕως οὗ (Matt. 14:22), and ἕως ὅτου (5:25). They are all used in substantially the same sense. A past event is expressed by the past indicative as ἕως ἦλθεν (Matt. 24:39), ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη (Matt. 13:33), and ἕως ὅτου ἐφώνησαν (Jo. 9:18). Where used about present time ἕως has the sense of "while" and not "until." So ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον (Mk. 6:45) after ἠνάγκασεν with which

compare the Latin *dum*. This is in truth the meaning of ἕως in ἕως ἔρχομαι (Jo. 21:22 f. and 1 Tim. 4:13) where the future is vividly drawn into the present or the speaker mentally leaps into the future. Even ἕως ὅτου occurs once in this sense, ἕως ὅτου εἶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Matt. 5:25). Blass indeed contends for the sense of "until" here also (*Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 219) and even in ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι (Lu. 19:13), a rather severe strain on the Greek idiom. For events in the future only the aorist subjunctive seems to be found though in ἕως ὅτου σκάψω (Lu. 13:8) and ἕως οὗ ἀναπέμψω (Acts 25:21) the form is the same in the future indicative. Ἄν is not used with ἕως οὗ and ἕως ὅτου, but is very common with ἕως (as ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν, Lu. 9:27), but not always (ἕως προσεύξωμαι, Mk. 14:32). In Rev. 20:5 ἄχρι τελεσθῇ is still future though preceded by ἔζησαν.

(c) Μέχρι is less used both as a preposition (μέχρι τῆς σήμερον, Matt. 11:23) and as a conjunction (only three times in reality, Mk. 13:30, Gal. 4:19, Eph. 4:13). Once (Eph. 4:13) the form is μέχρι and in the other passages we have μέχρις οὗ. In all three the aorist subjunctive is the construction and without ἄν.

(d) Πρίν (five times πρὶν ἤ as Acts 25:16) appears thirteen times and always with the infinitive save twice in negative sentences. One of these has the subjunctive with ἄν referring to a future event, μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν ἢ ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν Χριστὸν κυρίου (Lu. 2:26). The other has the optative with the same idea, but in indirect discourse, πρὶν ἢ . . . . ἔχοι (Acts 25:16). Both of these idiomatic constructions are in the writings of Luke. The rest are like πρὶν γενέσθαι (Jo. 14:29).

(e) Akin to πρίν is the use of πρὸ τοῦ and the infinitive of which there are eight examples in the New Testament. See πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν (Matt. 6:8).

(f) Ἐν ᾧ comes to be used much like a temporal conjunction with one sense of ἕως (while). So in Mk. 2:19, ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν. Cf. also John 5:7 (ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι). Ἐν ᾧ may also be local (Rom. 2:1), causal (Rom. 8:3), or instrumental (Rom. 14:21). Cf. Thayer. With this use of ἐν ᾧ may be compared the very frequent use of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive in temporal relations as ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν (Mk. 6:48).

(g) Ἀφ' οὗ calls also for a word of comment. In Lu. 13:7 ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι presents no difficulty, but in 13:25 ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ reminds one at once of ἕως and indeed ἀφ' οὗ here has the resultant sense of "when once" (cf. until) and so the construction of ἕως when used of future events.

3. The other constructions may be treated together somewhat loosely.

(a) Ἡνίκα is only found twice, both times about the future, once with ἄν and the present subjunctive and once with ἐάν and the aorist subjunctive. Both examples appear also in 2 Cor. 3, one in 15 (ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται), the other in 16 (ἡνίκα ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ).

(b) Ἐπεί of itself has nearly vanished as a temporal conjunction in the New Testament; only once as a marginal reading in WH. (Lu. 7:1). But ἐπάν with the subjunctive is found three times (Matt. 2:8; Lu. 11:22,34). So ἐπὰν εὕρητε (Matt. 2:8). The only temporal use of ἐπειδή is the text of Lu. 7:1 (ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν).

(c) WH do not read ὁπότε at all, but some MSS. have it instead of ὅτε in Lu. 6:3.

(d) But ὅτε and ὅταν are the commonest temporal conjunctions in the New Testament. Perhaps little trouble will be found with ὅτε which is freely used with any tense of the indicative as ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν (Matt. 7:28). Ὅταν on the other hand is equally frequent with the subjunctive (usually aorist). So ὅταν ἴδητε (Matt. 24:33) and occasionally the present as ὅταν εἰσφέρωσιν (Lu. 12:11). Occasionally also the future indicative is found as ὅταν δώσουσιν (Rev. 4:9), the aorist indicative as ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο (Mk. 11:19), the imperfect indicative as ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν (Mk. 3:11), and even the present indicative as ὅταν στήκετε (Mk. 11:25). As with the relative clauses we observe two kinds of temporal clauses, the definite and the indefinite. Ἄν is more common, of course, with the indefinite clauses, but sometimes as in Rev. 8:1 it is found with the definite temporal clause (ὅταν ἤνοιξεν).

(e) Ὡς deserves a word also. As a temporal conjunction ὡς commonly has the indicative as ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν (Lu. 1:23) and with ἄν as ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε (1 Cor. 12:2). But it sometimes appears with the subjunctive as in ὡς καιρὸν ἔχωμεν (Gal. 6:10) where the state-

ment is indefinite, and a few times with ἄν also as ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι (Rom. 15:24).

(f) In Matt. 9:15 we have ἐφ' ὅσον, in Mk. 2:19 ὅσον χρόνον, in Rom. 7:1 ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον in the temporal sense, and several other times also. In Heb. 10:37 ὅσον ὅσον is a Hebraism (LXX) though not unlike the papyri examples.

(g) Μετὰ τὸ and the infinitive is found a few times with the sense of "after." So μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆναι (Mk. 1:14).

4. Participles very often occur with the temporal resultant idea. The participle in itself does not express cause, condition, or time, but the context frequently suggests such conceptions for the circumstantial participle. Whether this resultant idea is when, as, which, after, etc., only the context can decide. As an example take ἀποθνήσκων (Heb. 11:21). The aorist participle may suggest antecedent action as εἰσελθών (Mk. 1:21) or simultaneous action as ἀσπασάμενοι (Acts 25:13). But more of this when we come to the participle.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

COMPARATIVE CLAUSES.

1. These clauses are not always given adequate treatment in the grammars, but the number of conjunctions that are used call for separate discussion. They are chiefly modifications of a few basal forms.

2. The relative pronoun occurs with *κατά* as *καθό, καθά, καθάπερ.* *Καθό* is found only four times and with the indicative as *καθὸ δεῖ* (Rom. 8:26) save once with the subjunctive and *ἐάν* as *καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῃ* (2 Cor. 8:12). *Καθά* we have only once and that with the indicative, *καθὰ συνέταξεν* (Matt. 27:10). *Καθάπερ* is more frequent, but always with the indicative as *καθάπερ γέγραπται* (Rom. 3:4).

3. *Καθότι* is a comparative conjunction twice only in the New Testament (Acts 2:45; 4:35) and both times with the same construction, *ἄν* and the indicative; *καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.* Cf. *ὅπου ἄν εἰσεπορεύετο* (Mk. 6:56).

4. Four times in Hebrews we find the classic idiom of the comparative with *ὅσος.* It is significant that here only does it occur. Hebrews aims to set forth the superiority of Christianity to Judaism. In Heb. 1:4 we read *ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα;* in 8:6 *ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης;* in 10:25 *τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε.* The fourth example is in 3:3 *καθ' ὅσον πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου.* The correlative *τοσοῦτος* occurs only once in this connection. In Heb. 7:20 ff. (*καθ' ὅσον . . . . κατὰ τοσοῦτο*) the comparative is not in the relative clause.

5. The various forms of *ὡς* are far the most common in comparative sentences. *Καθώς* is very frequent indeed with the indicative. So *καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς* (Jo. 13:34). It is usual in the idiom *καθὼς γέγραπται* (Rom. 1:17). The correlative *οὕτως* (2 Cor. 8:6) is rarely used with *καθώς.* See also Lu. 24:24. *Καθώς* is a late word, but

is frequent in the papyri as in the New Testament. Καθώσπερ appears only once (Heb. 5:4 καθώσπερ καὶ Ἀαρών) save in 2 Cor. 3:18 where WH give it in the margin, text καθάπερ. Sometimes καθώς shades off towards a reason (causal sentence) as in Rom. 1:28. Ὡς is so common as to require little comment, but its uses are very numerous. Its use as a temporal and final conjunction has already been discussed. It is as a comparative conjunction, however, that it has its widest range. Usually ὡς is used with the indicative expressed (ὡς θέλεις, Matt. 15:28) or implied (οὐκ ἐσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, Matt. 6:5). But occasionally the subjunctive occurs (ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ, Mk. 4:26) and also with ἄν or ἐάν (ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, 1 Thess. 2:7). See Rom. 5:15 for ὡς . . . . οὕτως. The instances of ὡς with adverbs (ὡς τάχιστα, Acts 17:15), with adjectives (ὡς ὡραῖοι, Rom. 10:15), are like Latin *quam*. This last is exclamation like our "how." Ὡς with the participle gives the alleged reason (ὡς μέλλων, Acts 23:20). In Lu. 9:52 we have ὡς ἑτοιμάσαι (inf.) according to WH. Ὡσεί (ὡς, εἰ) appears without a verb in the New Testament. Take Matt. 3:16 as an example, εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστεράν. Ὥσπερ is used either with the indicative (ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσιν, Matt. 6:2), with a participle (ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς, Acts 2:2), or without a verb (ὥσπερ οἱ ἐθνικοί, Matt. 6:7). Ὡσπερεί is found once only (1 Cor. 15:8) and without the verb, ὡσπερεί τῷ ἐκτρώματι.

CHAPTER XXIX.

INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES.

1. The Greek originally used no mark of interrogation and it is sometimes doubtful whether a sentence is a question or not. Interrogatory particles were not always used. Take as an example 1 Cor. 1:13. WH punctuate *μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός.* The margin reads *Χριστός;* But as a rule the context makes it clear even if no interrogative particle nor pronoun is used. But *ἆρα, εἰ, οὐ,* and *μή* all appear in direct questions.

2. The mode in direct questions calls for little comment. The indicative (any tense) is, of course, the most frequent as *σὺ τίς εἶ;* (Jo. 1:19). The delibrative subjunctive is common in questions of doubt as *δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν* (Mk. 12:15). The optative with *ἄν* appears in a direct question as the apodosis of a fourth class condition (potential optative). So *Τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν;* (Acts 17:18). The mode in the indirect question is usually the same as it was in the direct either the indicative as *τί ἦν* (Jo. 2:25), the subjunctive as *τί φάγωσιν* (Mk. 6:36), or the optative as *τί ἂν θέλοι* (Lu. 1:62). Sometimes the indicative becomes optative according to classic idiom in indirect questions as *τίς εἴη* (Acts 21:33), but it is here followed by *τί ἐστιν πεποιηκώς.* See further in chapter on Indirect Discourse.

3. The kind of answer that is expected is sometimes, though not always, indicated. The inquiry may be colorless in form as *Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα;* (Matt. 13:51), even when the particle *ἆρα* is used as *Ἆρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις;* (Acts 8:30). But if *οὐ* occurs, the affirmative answer is indicated as *Οὐκ εἰμί ἐλεύθερος;* (1 Cor. 9:1). When *μή* is used, the negative answer is expected as *Μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ;* (Rom. 11:1). Sometimes a great deal of feeling is suggested, of scorn (Jo. 7:47, *μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς πεπλά-*

νησθε;), of sympathy (Jo. 6:67, μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν;), of suppressed excitement (Jo. 4:29, μή τι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;). For further examples see chapter on Negative Particles.

4. The interrogative pronoun usually found in the New Testament is τίς. We have it by itself as τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν; (Matt. 3:7), but it is common also with ἄρα (as Matt. 24:45), with γάρ (Matt. 9:5), with οὖν (Lu. 3:10). For ἵνα τί see Matt. 9:4. In Mk. 15:24 we have the double interrogative τίς τί ἄρῃ. In Lu. 16:2 τοῦτο is used predicatively with τί (τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ;). In 1 Pet. 1:11 we find both τίς and ποῖος. Ποταπός like τίς and ποῖος occurs both in direct and in indirect questions. In Lu. 7:39 it is used with τίς. Τί is frequently an adverb in the sense of "why" (cf. διὰ τί, Matt. 9:11 and εἰς τί, Mk. 14:4) as τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; (Mk. 10:18) or "how" (τί ὅτι, Lu. 2:49). For πόσος (Mk. 6:38) and the other interrogative pronouns see chapter on Pronouns. But note τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι (Acts 13:25).

5. There is a certain amount of confusion between the interrogative and the relative pronouns in the New Testament as in the older Greek and in most languages. Cf. Blass, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 175. See also Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 93. So τίς appears where the relative would be more usual as in Jas. 3:13 τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν, δειξάτω. In Mk. 1:24 we have οἶδά σὲ τίς εἶ which may be so explained or as the prolepsis of σύ and change to accusative. Compare Jo. 8:25 σὺ τίς εἶ; In the New Testament the direct interrogative pronoun is usually present in indirect questions. But in 1 Tim. 1:7 we have ἃ λέγουσιν and περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται. On τὶ and τί cf. 1 Cor. 14:35 and Acts 13:25. Once (Acts 9:6) we have ὅτι so used and several times ὁποῖος (1 Cor. 3:13). Once also ὅπως occurs in an indirect question (Lu. 24:20). On the other hand WH admit ὅτι (from ὅστις) as a direct interrogative in Mark 2:16; 9:11,28. It may fairly be questioned, however, if this is not an abbreviation of τί ὅτι. But ὅτι in Jo. 8:25 is more difficult still. In Matt. 26:50 (ἑταῖρε ἐφ' ὃ πάρει) we meet a hard problem also. Here we may either like Chrysostom supply an imperative and have the usual relative, or treat ὅ as a demonstrative (Noah K. Davis), or treat the relative ὅ as interrogative (incredible according

to Blass). Certainly the relative is used in indirect questions a few times as ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν (Mk. 5:19). The difference between interrogative and relative comes out well in Jo. 13:24 (εἰπὲ τίς ἐστιν περὶ οὗ λέγει). Cf. also 2 Tim. 1:12 (ᾧ πεπίστευκα).

6. The interrogative conjunctions are freely used in the New Testament. So πότε (Matt. 25:38), ἕως πότε (Matt. 17:17), ποῦ (Lu. 8:25), πῶς (Lu. 10:26). They are common also in indirect questions (Matt. 24:3; Mk. 15:47; Matt. 6:28). Ὅπως appears in indirect questions alone in Lu. 24:20.

7. Elliptical phrases are frequent also. So ἵνα τί (Matt. 9:4) where γένηται has dropped out (cf. διὰ τί, εἰς τί); τί ὅτι (Lu. 2:49) with which compare τί γέγονεν ὅτι in Jo. 14:22. A similar condensation is observed in τί ἄρα Πέτρος ἐγένετο (Acts 12:18). Cf. also Acts 5:24; Lu. 1:66; Jo. 21:21. The use of εἰ in direct questions as εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεῦσαι (Matt. 12:10) is parallel to εἰ in indirect questions like διώκω εἰ καταλάβω (Phil. 3:12). Cf. also Acts 17:27 where aim and expectation enter in. One may compare also the use of εἰ as in Heb. 3:11 in a negative sense (strong oath) where there is really an ellipse. The same thing (ellipse) is true with the use of εἰ in direct questions which is rather common in the New Testament.

8. Alternative questions are not very frequent in the New Testament. In fact we have only one example of πότερον . . . . ἤ (Jo. 7:17), and that in an indirect question. Often ἤ is used in the second member of the question without the interrogative pronoun as in 1 Cor. 9:8. Sometimes we have τίς . . . . ἤ as in Matt. 9:5. Sometimes ἤ precedes τίς and refers to the preceding sentence (Matt. 7:9).

9. Exclamations are usually expressed in the older Greek by the pronouns οἷος, ὁποῖος, ὅσος, but occasionally the interrogative forms are so used. So πόσα in Mk. 15:4 and πηλίκος in Gal. 6:11. Cf. also τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη (Lu. 12:49). Cf. also ὡς ὡραῖοι in Rom. 10:15.

10. Interjections are frequently used in exclamations. Those in the New Testament are δεῦτε, ἔα, ἴδε, ἰδού, οὐά, οὐαί, ὦ, etc. For δεῦτε as an interjection see Matt. 21:38 (δεῦτε, ἀποκτείνωμεν). In Lu.

4:34 we have an example of ἔα as ἔα, *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί;* In Jo. 1:29 (ἴδε ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ) ἴδε, as often, is found with the nominative. With the accusative it is the verb. Ἰδού is used absolutely (Matt. 11:10) or with the nominative (Matt. 17:5, ἰδοὺ νεφέλη). It is very common. In Mk. 15:29 (οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων) οὐά occurs with the nominative. Οὐαί is used commonly with the dative as οὐαὶ σοί (Matt. 11:21). But it twice occurs with the accusative (Rev. 8:13, τοὺς κατοικοῦντας; 12:12, τὴν γῆν). It is also used absolutely as in Rev. 18:10). Once it is repeated three times (Rev. 8:13). Ὦ is not often used. The vocative is usually alone as ἄνθρωπε (Lu. 22:58), but sometimes ὦ is added as ὦ γύναι (Matt. 15:28).

CHAPTER XXX.

INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

1. Direct discourse is far more frequent than indirect in the New Testament. This is true also of the Old Testament and of most popular writers. Prolonged indirect discourse as in Thucydides or Livy is labored and artificial. The Greeks had no quotation marks, but ὅτι often served this purpose. This use of ὅτι is called recitative ὅτι and is very abundant in the New Testament as in the Septuagint. So Mk. 8:28 ὅτι Ἰωάνην τὸν βαπτιστήν, Jo. 10:36 ὅτι βλασφημεῖς. But this pictorial use of *oratio recta* rather than the long *oratio obliqua* of the Greek historians is not dependent on ὅτι. Often the direct quotation appears alone: Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι (Matt. 8:3). Note also ὁ διδάσκαλος and ὁ κύριος in Jo. 13:13).

2. The tense as a rule remains unchanged in the Greek indirect discourse. In Latin and English we find sequence of tenses in this class of sentences. But in Greek this is seldom the case. Some examples occur in the New Testament as in the older Greek where the imperfect in the indirect seems to represent a present in the direct. So Jo. 2:25, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Commonly the tense is preserved as in Jo. 11:13, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἔδοξαν ὅτι περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως τοῦ ὕπνου λέγει. In a case like ὅτι εἶδον (Jo. 1:50) the tense was aorist in the direct discourse. So as to ἦν in Jo. 9:18. The future infinitive in indirect discourse as χωρήσειν in Jo. 21:25 stands for the future indicative of the direct. So the perfect infinitive likewise as τεθνηκέναι in Acts 14:19.

3. The person of the verb may or may not be changed according to circumstances. Take Matt. 6:31, for instance, where Τί φάγωμεν is the direct question. In the indirect question (Matt. 6:25) this becomes τί φάγητε. So in Mk. 9:6 οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ was τί ἀποκριθῶ in the direct. In Acts 1:4 the person of the direct

address is retained after the infinitive: *περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου.* But more of this mixture now directly.

4. The mode in indirect discourse may be changed. This change of indicative to optative or subjunctive to optative after a past tense was never obligatory and gradually died out with the passing of the optative. It was often not done in the older Greek. It is only in the writings of Luke that it occurs at all in the New Testament. Even so it is only in indirect questions that we find it with one exception. This exception (Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 133) is in Acts 25:16 and is after *πρὶν ἤ*. But curiously enough in the same sentence *οὐκ ἔστιν* is retained. The sequence of the verbs in the sentence is therefore *ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν . . . . πρὶν ἢ . . . . ἔχοι . . . . τε . . . . λάβοι.* So also in Lu. 22:23 we have *τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη*, but in 22:24 *τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ*. The presence of the subjunctive in an indirect question simply means that the subjunctive was used in the direct. So Lu. 22:4 *τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῷ αὐτόν.* If *ἄν* is found with the optative in an indirect question, that shows that it was there in the direct. There is a distinct difference therefore between *τίς εἴη* (Acts 21:33), where the optative is due to indirect discourse, and *τί ἂν εἴη* (Acts 10:17) where the optative with *ἄν* was so used in the direct. Cf. Acts 17:18 where *τί ἂν θέλοι* occurs in the direct question as the potential optative (apodosis of fourth class condition). Cf. Lu. 15:26 (*τί ἂν εἴη ταῦτα*).

5. There are three kinds of indirect discourse: indirect assertion, indirect question, and indirect command. An example of the first is *θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ* (Jo. 4:19), of the second is *ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε* (Lu. 12:5), of the third is *εἰπὸν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται* (Lu. 10:40). These represent the normal classes. They require separate treatment.

6. Indirect assertions once more fall into three classes according to the construction that is used.

(a) There is first the infinitive. This was in the old Greek the commonest usage and it is still found in substantial accord with ancient practice. The tense, of course, is the same as the direct discourse. It is usual to say that this infinitive has the accusative

as the subject, but this is an inadequate explanation. The accusative is by no means always used and when it is we cannot call it the subject from the Greek point of view. The infinitive, like the participle, is not a finite verb, has no personal endings. The idiom does in a general way correspond to a ὅτι clause in Greek or a "that" clause in English, but it is not in fact a ὅτι clause. The infinitive in indirect discourse still has to be considered an infinitive and explained syntactically as an infinitive. If the pronoun or adjective used with the infinitive refers to the subject of the principal verb, it may be in the nominative by apposition as φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν (Rom. 1:22, cf. Matt. 19:21 τέλειος εἶναι); or it may be unexpressed as ἦλθαν λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι (Lu. 24:23); or it may be in the accusative of general reference as πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν (Rom. 2:19). Cf. also Phil. 3:13; Lu. 24:23 (λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν). The same principle applies when the infinitive is used with a preposition and the article, both of which have to be conserved in any true syntactical explanation of this accusative. It is ridiculous to think of a "subject" with such an infinitive with the article as ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι (Lu. 10:35). Note με, not the reflexive. When the reference is not to the subject of the principal verb, the noun or pronoun is normally in the accusative of general reference as οἳ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν (Lu. 24:23). The same explanation applies to two accusatives like πεπεισμένος γάρ ἐστιν Ἰωάνην προφήτην εἶναι (Lu. 20:6) where one is in apposition to the other. In a case like διά γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν χήραν ταύτην (Lu. 18:5) one accusative is the object of the infinitive, the other is in the accusative of general reference. Note the article. Indeed three accusatives may appear with an infinitive as in Heb. 5:12 (WH): τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα. Here τινὰ is accusative of general reference and the other accusatives the objects of διδάσκειν. The negative of this accusative is μή as οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι (Mk. 12:18).

(b) Ὅτι and the indicative is in the New Testament the common way of expressing indirect assertions. The optative is not so used save in the case of πρὶν ἤ once (Acts 25:16) which is dependent on ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι. Ὡς does not so appear though in Acts 10:28

(ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν) it approaches the ancient usage. Cf. also Lu. 24:6. Ὅτι is used with almost every variety of verbs of thinking and saying. Blass (*Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 230 ff.) has a careful discussion of the construction of each verb and phrase in the New Testament. As to verbs of thinking most of them take either construction (infinitive or ὅτι) and some the third also (the participle). So with καταλαμβάνω we have the infinitive in Acts 25:25 (ἐγὼ δὲ κατελαβόμην μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θανάτου πεπραχέναι), but in Acts 10:34 ὅτι (καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν). On the whole the use of the infinitive in indirect discourse is much more common in Luke and Paul (and Hebrews) than elsewhere in the New Testament though not frequent even there. This applies to verbs of saying also. Ἀποκρίνομαι, for instance, is used with the infinitive in indirect assertion only in Luke as Acts 25:4, ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον. For ὅτι see Acts 25:16. In 1 Cor. 10:19 ὅτι is used after φημί as is occasionally true in the older Greek. A good example of the use of the tense is found in Gal. 2:14 (ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν). So also note ἐνόμισαν ὅτι πλεῖον λήμψονται (Matt. 20:10. In Jo. 9:32 we have ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἠνέωξεν, but the tense is that of the direct. Only the context can tell whether ὅτι is declarative or causal as ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸν ἦν δεδεκώς (Acts 22:29). Blass (*Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p, 231) calls ὡς ὅτι (2 Cor. 11:21) "unclassical." In 1 Cor. 15:27 δῆλον ὅτι is used almost like an adverb as in ancient Greek.

(c) The participle is sometimes used according to the ancient idiom with verbs of knowing, perceiving, showing, etc. This construction is generally found in Luke and Paul. Take Lu. 8:46, ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, as an example. Cf. also ἀκούσας δὲ Ἰακὼβ ὄντα σιτία (Acts 7:12), ὁρῶ σε ὄντα (Acts 8:23). Ἀκούω is thus used with the participle, the infinitive, or with ὅτι. Likewise γινώσκω and οἶδα may be used with either construction. Θεωρέω occurs with ὅτι or the participle.

(d) The construction with καὶ ἐγένετο calls for a word of comment. We have καὶ ἐγένετο . . . . ἔλαχε (Lu. 1:8) without any conjunction. So 1:41; 2:1, etc. In Matt. 9:10 καὶ follows καὶ ἐγένετο almost in the sense of ὅτι (like Hebrew *vav*), καὶ ἐγένετο . . . . καὶ

ἰδοὺ . . . . συνανέκειντο). Cf. Lu. 24:4. In Mk. 2:15 the infinitive is used with γίνεται, καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτόν. Cf. Lu. 3:21; 6:1, etc. In Luke καὶ ἐγένετο with the infinitive is common. Cf. Jo. 14:22, τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις.

7. Indirect questions do not present so many complications.

(a) The tense, as already explained, remains unchanged as a rule. So Mk. 15:44 we have ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν. This is the ancient use of εἰ after θαυμάζω. In the same verse the aorist follows: ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ ἤδη ἀπέθανεν. The point lies in the difference between the two tenses. However, the imperfect indicative is sometimes used where the present was the direct (sequence of tenses like Latin and English). So Jo. 2:24 (τί ἦν) and 6:6 (ἤδει τί ἔμελλεν ποιεῖν). Thus also in Acts 19:32 τίνος ἕνεκα συνεληλύθεισαν after οὐκ ἤδεισαν.

(b) The indicative may be retained in an indirect question as ἦλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστιν τὸ γεγονός (Mk. 5:14). But in Luke the optative is found as ἐπυνθάνετο τί εἴη τοῦτο (Lu. 18:36). The indicative is never changed into the subjunctive in such a sentence as in Latin.

(c) Whenever the subjunctive appears, as it often does, in an indirect question, it was there in the direct question. It is usually retained in the New Testament as οὐ γὰρ ἤδει τί ἀποκριθῇ (Mk. 9:6), but in Luke a few times the optative occurs instead of the subjunctive as εἰ ἄραγε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὕροιεν (Acts 17:27). In Matt. 6:25 τί φάγητε occurs in an indirect question. In Matt. 6:31 τί φάγωμεν; is the direct question. The mood is the same in both cases and for the same reason, a deliberative question.

(d) Sometimes the optative is found in the indirect question because it was in the direct (cf. indicative and subjunctive). This is true of all the examples with ἄν and the optative like τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν (Lu. 9:46). Cf. Lu. 6:11. Cf. also τί ἂν θέλοι (Acts 17:18) in a direct question with τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι (Lu. 1:62) in the indirect.

(e) The indirect deliberative question may be dependent on a verb like ἔχω which does not often have a question as object (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 135). So οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ (Lu. 9:58). Cf. σχῶ τί γράψω (Acts 25:26). So too ὅπου is found

(Mk. 14:14) with the subjunctive (ὅπου . . . . φάγω). In Lu. 3:15 μή ποτε αὐτὸς εἴη is indirect question.

(f) Luke is rather fond of the article with the indirect question. So τὸ πῶς . . . . παραδῷ (Lu. 22:4), τὸ τίς εἴη (22:23), τὸ τίς . . . . δοκεῖ (22:24).

(g) Once indeed Nestle (1 Pet. 5:8) has the infinitive in this construction (ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν), but WH properly omit τίνα and have τινά in margin (not τίνα).

8. Indirect commands are expressed in three ways.

(a) The infinitive is common with the same tense as the direct command. The negative is μή. So ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν (Acts 21:4), λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν (Acts 21:21), ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν (Acts 26:20), βοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν (Acts 25:24, note two infinitives).

(b) Conjunctions (ἵνα and ὅπως) are also used with a finite verb. So παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν (Mk. 6:8). Observe retention of the subjunctive after secondary tense. So also ὅπως μεταπέμψηται (Acts 25:3).

(c) Sometimes an indirect deliberative question with the subjunctive represents a command or prohibition. In Luke 12:5 ὑποδείξω τίνα φοβηθῆτε was originally (see very next verse) φοβήθητε.

9. There is not infrequently mixture of the direct and the indirect discourse in the same sentence. The change may be from the indirect to the direct as in παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς ἐμέ (Acts 23:22), or from the direct to the indirect as in εἶπεν Ἑτοιμάσατε . . . . κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι (Acts 23:23). In Acts 14:22 we have ὅτι . . . . δεῖ parallel with ἐμμένειν. And in Acts 27:10 ὅτι is even used with μέλλειν, a mixture of the infinitive and the ὅτι constructions.

10. The subordinate clause retains as a rule the tense and mode both of the direct. So ὅσα ἔχει in Matt. 18:25 (ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος πραθῆναι καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ ὅσα ἔχει). So in Matt. 14:22 we have ἠνάγκασεν . . . . προάγειν . . . . ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE INFINITIVE.

1. The origin of the infinitive is clear from the analogy of the Sanskrit which had a great number of pure verbal substantives in various cases with no voice and no tense. The Greek δόμεναι (δοῦναι) is in the same case as the Sanskrit *devanê*, for instance. The infinitive in -αι, -σθαι, -ναι are in the dative case while the form in -ειν (-ενι) is possibly in the locative. So originally this verbal substantive was used chiefly with the dative idea. In Homer the dative idea is still the more usual one, although already the form is no longer regarded as dative, but merely a set form that is indeclinable, and the infinitive is beginning to be used as the object and subject of verbs. In Matt. 11:7 this original dative idea is preserved, as is true wherever the infinitive has the idea of purpose: Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; In Sanskrit the noun idea is dominant over the verbal, but already in Homer the verbal idea is on a par with the nominal conception.

2. The idea of the infinitive in Greek is that of a verbal substantive with emphasis on both terms. It is ὄνομα ῥήματος, but is still ὄνομα. The infinitive is non-finite, not limited, and so expresses undefined action. The infinitive has no manner of affirmation and is not a mode, but is always both verb and substantive. It is the most general and indefinite form of the verb. The point is that the Greek infinitive has to be looked at each time both as a substantive and as a verb. It no longer has inflection as most substantives have and so is an indeclinable substantive. It never developed personal endings like the modes and so has no subject in the strict sense of the term.

3. The history of the infinitive is very interesting. Burton (*N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 143 f.) has an excellent sketch of this

matter. He marks four stages which I here enlarge and change to five:

(1) When the infinitive was used only in the sense of the dative (or locative) case. This was in prehistoric times (cf. Sanskrit).

(2) The infinitive begins to be used without regard to the import of the dative (or locative) ending. The same form occurs as subject or object of verbs. Thus in Homer.

(3) The infinitive is used freely with the article and without it in various cases and with the force of the cases. This from Pindar on. A great many uses of the infinitive.

(4) In the κοινή the infinitive begins to disappear before ἵνα and ὅτι. In the Septuagint and the New Testament there is the counter increase in the use of τοῦ and the infinitive as a special side development.

(5) In the modern Greek the infinitive has vanished save that after auxiliary verbs it exists in a mutilated form as θέλει λύσει. In the Pontic dialect the infinitive continues to flourish.

4. The use of the article with the infinitive has given rise to a deal of misapprehension. Even Winer (*Winer-Thayer*, p. 323) speaks of the article "making" the infinitive a substantive. The infinitive is always a substantive and like other substantives may or may not use the article according to circumstances. What the article does do with the infinitive is to make clear that it is definite. Homer does not use the article with the infinitive, although Pindar does. The article does not make the infinitive a substantive. It is always a substantive and in a case whether it has the article or not. In Homer the article is not used much with anything. In general the infinitive uses the article much as any other abstract neuter substantive that occurs only in the singular. So τὸ γὰρ θέλειν (Rom. 7:18). In Heb. 2:15 πᾶς is used with the infinitive, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν.

5. Cases of the infinitive. As an indeclinable substantive, the infinitive may be in any case, though the vocative naturally is not used. When the article occurs with the infinitive, the inflection of the article makes the case plain. Thus in καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν (Matt. 18:8) the infinitive is in the nominative case as plainly as

in τὸ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι (Rom. 7:18). In λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι (Matt. 5:34) the infinitive is just as truly in the accusative as in οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (Phil. 2:6). So the infinitive may be in the genitive as in ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι (Lu. 1:9), the ablative as in μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν με (Matt. 19:14) and κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι (Lu. 4:42), the instrumental as in τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον (2 Cor. 2:13), the dative as in οἴδατε . . . . διδόναι (Matt. 7:11) and ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι (Matt. 2:2). The infinitive, like the substantive, may be used in apposition. So τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες, ἀπέχεσθαι (Acts 15:28), the ablative.

6. The common use of τοῦ and the infinitive in the New Testament (as in the LXX) calls for special remark. It may be in the ablative as in ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι (Lu. 24:16), but as a rule it is the genitive (cf. Heb. infinitive construct which idiom partly explains its frequency in the LXX). It exists already in the older Greek to express purpose in the genitive and this is the commonest use in the New Testament, as in ζητεῖν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι (Matt. 2:13). See Lu. 1:76 where ἑτοιμάσαι and τοῦ δοῦναι both express purpose. It is even held by some writers that τοῦ with the infinitive occasionally expresses result in the New Testament. But this may be doubted. All the examples given (Matt. 21:32; Acts 7:19; 18:10; Rom. 7:3) betray purpose if the article is closely observed as it must be. Τοῦ and the infinitive may be used with nouns (genitive) as ἐλπὶς τοῦ σώζεσθαι (Acts 27:20), adjectives as βραδεῖς τοῦ πιστεῦσαι (Lu. 24:25) and verbs as μετεμελήθητε τοῦ πιστεῦσαι (Matt. 21:32). But strangest of all is it to see τοῦ and the infinitive as the subject of a verb as in ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ . . . . μὴ ἐλθεῖν (Lu. 17:1). Cf. Acts 10:25. Just as the dative and locative endings lost their force with the infinitive, so τοῦ sometimes comes to be regarded as a fixed idiom.

7. The infinitive can be used with verbs as δύναται . . . . δουλεύειν (Matt. 6:24), with substantives as ὁρμὴ ὑβρίσαι (Acts 14:5), with adjectives as ἱκανὸς λῦσαι (Mk. 1:7), and with prepositions as ἐν τῷ εἶναι (Lu. 9:18).

8. The infinitive is so frequent with prepositions that a special paragraph is called for. The article is uniformly present with this

use of the infinitive to show that the preposition is not in composition with the infinitive. The cases of the infinitive are those common in the New Testament with prepcsitions. The prepositions thus found with the infinitive are mainly *ἀντί*, *εἰς*, *ἐν*, *ἕνεκεν*, *ἐξ*, *ἕως*, *διά*, *μετά*, *πρός*, *πρό*. Take an illustration of each: *ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν* (Jas. 4:15), *εἰς τὸ εἶναι* (Rom. 1:20), *ἐν τῷ εἶναι* (Lu. 9:18, very common in Luke), *ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι* (2 Cor. 7:12), *ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν* (2 Cor. 8:11), *ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν* (Acts 8:40), *διὰ τὸ παρέχειν* (Lu. 18:5), *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* (Lu. 22:20), *πρὸς τὸ δεῖν* (Lu. 18:1), *πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν* (Lu. 22:15). The infinitive with prepositions is used just like indirect discourse. So *μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω* (Mk. 14:28).

9. The infinitive in indirect discourse was sufficiently treated in that chapter. But the confusion on the subject will justify a few further remarks. It is not strictly correct to say that the infinitive has a subject in indirect discourse. That is to put the idiom of the English finite clause into the Greek infinitive clause. The Greek infinitive clause is not a finite clause at all, and is not so conceived in Greek. The infinitive itself is the object of the verb of saying or thinking, and not the substantive, as Hadley and Allen argue in sec. 943. The infinitive in indirect discourse is thus simply the direct object of the principal verb. The subject of the verb in the direct discourse is then treated variously. If it is the same as the subject of the principal verb, it is simply retained in the nominative. If the subject is different, it is put in the accusative, the case of extension ("accusative of definition," Green), or is in apposition with another word in the sentence; the action of the infinitive is true as far as so and so (whatever the substantive may be). So also if the pronoun refers to the subject, it may be in the accusative as in Lu. 24:30 (*αὐτόν*). This is indeed "virtual predication" (Monro), but it is not technical (syntactical) predication, and should not be so explained. In the modern English idiom we reproduce such instances by finite clauses, but it is truer and simpler to treat the Greek idiom according to the Greek genius. The infinitive in indirect discourse is still a verbal substantive, and not really different from the infinitive elsewhere. The participle, being a verbal adjective, can have no

subject. The infinitive, being a verbal substantive, can have no subject. The use of an accusative of general reference with the infinitive does not change it into a finite mode. Nestle against WH reads *ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν* in 1 Pet. 5;8. See chapter on Indirect Discourse for examples. But Matt. 17:4 is a good one, *καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι.* Sometimes the dative is found with the infinitive (due to the verb, not the infinitive) as in *ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιθῆναι* (Mk. 6:39). The predicate adjective in such a case may be either the dative *Ῥωμαίοις οὖσιν* (Acts 16:21) or in the accusative as *ἐκλεξαμένους* (Acts 15:22), but note *-οις* in 15:25 (text of WH).

10. The infinitive was limited as an object clause on the one hand by *ὅτι* and on the other as an expression of purpose by *ἵνα.* The infinitive carries both ideas and more too. But it was gradually squeezed out between these two conjunctions. Signs of the non-final use of *ἵνα* are abundant in the New Testament as *ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσι* (Matt. 7:12). It is not strange that the infinitive gradually gave up the fight.

11. The infinitive is common for the expression of purpose as *καταλῦσαι* (Matt. 5:17). It may be questioned if the infinitive by itself was ever used to express clear result.

12. But *ὥστε* with the infinitive, which once was used for purpose, came to be used in the New Testament chiefly for result. So *ὥστε μὴ χρείαν ἔχειν* (1 Thess. 1:8). But design is also expressed by *ὥστε* (Lu. 4:29). *Ὡς* is only used twice with the infinitive in the New Testament, *ὡς ἑτοιμάσαι* (Lu. 9:52), *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν* (Heb. 7:9). Once also *ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν* (2 Cor. 10:9)

13. The infinitive may be used absolutely in strict harmony with its origin as a non-finite verbal substantive. Thus in greetings as *χαίρειν* (Jas. 1:1). As an imperative the infinitive presents the idea as an absolute idea. The connection suggests the duty or the command. So *κλαίειν* (Rom. 12:15), *στοιχεῖν* (Phil. 3:16).

14. The negative of the infinitive is always *μή* in the New Testament even in indirect assertions (Mk. 12:18). Sometimes *οὐ* is found with the infinitive, but it really goes with a single phrase rather than with the infinitive. So *καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι* (Heb. 7:11).

15. The infinitive may sometimes be periphrastic like other forms of the verb as in *ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον* (Lu. 9:18).

16. The voices of the infinitive. Originally as in the Sanskrit, the infinitive had no voices. Voice in the infinitive was a later development of the language. But all three voices come to be used freely with the infinitive and with the usual significance. But voice is a distinct addition to the original infinitive. Note *εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν* (Mk. 5:43).

17. The same remark applies to the tenses of the infinitive. Tense in the infinitive has no time except in indirect discourse. The infinitive has the aorist as a matter of course and when the present tense occurs it is to accent the idea of incompletion. Note both in the same sentence: *ἠνάγκασε τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι . . . . καὶ προάγειν* (Matt. 14:22). The perfect does not often occur and always to express completion. Cf. *ἀπηλλάχθαι* (Lu. 12:58) and *ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος* (Acts 26:32). Cf. also Mk. 5:4. Μέλλω, however, generally has the present infinitive as *μέλλει ζητεῖν* (Matt. 2:13), sometimes the future infinitive due to the future idea in *μέλλω* as *μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι* (Acts 11:28; 27:10), and only seldom the aorist as *ἤμελλεν προσαγαγεῖν* (Acts 12:6). Burton remarks (*Moods and Tenses*, p. 53) that no instance of the aorist infinitive representing an aorist indicative appears in the New Testament. The aorist infinitive in its usual timeless sense does occur, however, as in *γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν* (Lu. 24:46). The future infinitive in indirect discourse also appears as in *οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρήσειν* (Jo. 21:25). So also the perfect infinitive, *νομίζοντες αὐτὸν τεθνηκέναι* (Acts 14:19). Ἄν with the infinitive is not found in the New Testament.

18. The idiom *προσέθετο πέμψαι* (Lu. 20:11 f.) while explicable as Greek, is probably due to the common Hebrew construction.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE PARTICIPLE.

1. The participle has its most perfect development in the Greek language. Already in the Sanskrit the participle had developed voice (active and middle) and tense (aorist, present, perfect, and even the future). But the aorist participle did not survive in Sanskrit (cf. its absence in Latin). The Greek, however, revived the aorist participle and made it flourish. Already in Homer the aorist participle is abundant. In modern Greek the participle is little used, conjunctions displacing it. The English participle is much like the Greek in its freedom and adaptability. The Greek is a "participle loving language" (Broadus) and thus has a great advantage in flexibility over the Latin.

2. The participle is a verbal adjective. The participle (*pars, capio*) takes part, participates, shares in both verb and adjective, as the infinitive shares in both verb and substantive. It is always both verb and adjective. Like the infinitive the participle is also non-finite, undefined action. The participle makes no affirmation and is not a mode. It is a verb in exactly the same respects that the infinitive is. It has voice, tense, and governs the cases that the verb takes.

3. There are other verbal adjectives, as there were many verbal substantives (cf. the Sanskrit), which are not called participles. The verbals in -τος and -τέος, for instance, are verbal adjectives. They do not have voice and tense as the participle does. The verbal in -τος partakes more of the adjective idea and that in -τέος more of the verbal. The form in -τος is very common (in both the active and passive sense) in the New Testament as ὁ ἀγαπητός (Matt. 3:17). There is only one example of the verbal in -τέος which is impersonal and governs the case (accusative) of the verb, οἶνον νέον

εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον (Lu. 5:38). The verbal in -τέος is not found in Homer.

4. The difference between the participle and the infinitive is to be sharply noticed. The difference between infinitive and participle lies wholly in the fact that one is a substantive and the other an adjective. We found that the infinitive is an indeclinable verbal substantive, a fixed case form (dative), though used freely in any case, however, and in the singular only, either with or without the article. The participle is declined in both numbers and all the genders and all the cases and is used freely with or without the article. The infinitive as an object or subject verbal substantive is connected immediately with the verb while the participle is related to a substantive. So in Lu. 16:3 see what a different idea ἐπαιτῶν would present. ἐπαιτῶν would describe the man as a beggar who is ashamed of it; ἐπαιτεῖν presents one who is ashamed to beg and does not become a beggar. So likewise explain participle with φαίνομαι in Matt. 6:16. Compare infinitive with οἶδα (Matt. 7:11) and participle with εἶδον (Acts 3:9). See also Lu. 5:4 (ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν) and Acts 14:18 (κατέπαυσαν τοὺ μὴ θύειν). The infinitive in indirect discourse is the direct object or subject of the verb. The participle in indirect discourse is merely an adjective agreeing with the substantive. Like the infinitive the participle can have no subject. See Heb. 13:23 (γινώσκετε Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον) 1 Jo. 4:2 (ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν ἐληλυθότα). See difference between John 12:18 and 2 Thess. 3:11 (one infinitive and one participle with ἀκούω).

5. The participle like other adjectives may be used with or without the article, may be definite or indefinite. So we have ὕδωρ ζῶν (Jo. 4:10), but τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν (Jo. 4:11). In τί ἐστιν τὸ γεγονός (Mk. 5:14) we have a good example of the attributive participle. If the article is used, we know, as with other adjectives, that the participle is attributive. The article sometimes appears with the participle when it is not used with the substantive. So σοφίαν.... τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην (1 Cor. 2:7). Often the participle, like other adjectives again, occurs without any substantive as ὁ κλέπτων (Eph. 4:28). This use is practically equivalent to a relative clause. We even find πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος (Matt. 5:22). But if the article is not

used, the participle may be either predicate or attributive. The case of ὕδωρ ζῶν (Jo. 4:10) is attributive, but the predicate use is well shown in βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν (Heb. 10:25). Cf. also ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν πεσόντα (Lu. 10:18) and note tense.

6. The predicate participle is more complicated and calls for more discussion than the attributive which has more of the adjective and less of the verbal conception than the predicate. The predicate participle is more common in proportion than other predicate adjectives because of the verbal force of the participle. Both the predicate uses of the participle (circumstantial and supplementary) are very common, as frequent indeed as the attributive participle.

7. The supplementary participle. The supplementary participle is freely used in the New Testament and with εἰμί more commonly than in the earlier Greek, periphrastic construction. So Luke in particular (Lu. 13:10 f. ἦν διδάσκων, ἦν συνκύπτουσα). In Lu. 23:12 we find προϋπῆρχον ποτέ. ἄρχομαι is not used with the participle in the New Testament, but only with the infinitive, as Matt. 4:17, or absolutely, as Lu. 24:27. For the participle with ἔχω see Lu. 14:18 f. (ἔχε με παρῃτημένον). παύομαι is used only with the participle or absolutely (Acts 5:42; 1 Cor. 13:8). For τελέω with the participle see Matt. 11:1 (ἐτέλεσεν διατάσσων). In Matt. 6:16 ἵνα φανῶσιν νηστεύοντες is a good illustration of the supplementary participle. τυγχάνω in the New Testament is not used with the infinitive or the participle, nor is φθάνω (special sense of come or come before, Phil. 3:16). However, προφθάνω in Matt. 17:25 (προέφθασεν λέγων) is used with the participle according to ancient usage. λανθάνω is once (Heb. 13:2, ἔλαθον ξενίσαντες) used with participle according to the ancient idiom. No example of ἄν with the participle appears in the New Testament.

8. The circumstantial participle is practically an additional clause added more or less loosely. It is not essential to the leading clause. By means of the circumstantial participle a sentence can be strung out indefinitely. Cf. 2 Pet. 2:12-15 (βλασφημοῦντες, ἀδικούμενοι, ἡγούμενοι, ἐντρυφῶντες, etc.). The circumstantial participle does not of itself define its relation to the principal or sub-

ordinate clause in which it occurs. The connection is, of course, with some noun or pronoun. The context may be one that suggests time as ἀκούων ὁ Ἀνανίας πεσὼν ἐξέψυξεν (Acts 5:5), occasion as ἀκούοντες (Lu. 4:28), means as ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρεῖχεν μαντευομένη (Acts 16:16), manner as ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος (Matt. 19:22), cause as εὐχαριστοῦμεν ἀκούσαντες (Col. 1:4), purpose as ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων (Acts 8:27), condition as κρινεῖ ἡ ἀκροβυστία τελοῦσα (Rom. 2:27), concession as καί γε οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα (Acts 17:27). It is not proper to say that the participle means cause, condition, etc., but the context implies such an idea and the participle admits it.

9. The so-called genitive absolute is merely a circumstantial participle agreeing with the substantive in its case. In Latin the so-called Latin ablative absolute is either ablative, locative, or instrumental, according to circumstances. The Sanskrit uses the locative thus. Modern Greek uses the nominative. The ancient Greek is either genitive or ablative, or possibly now one and now the other. Usually the substantive is one that does not have close connection with the principal sentence, but this is not always so. See Mk. 8:1 (πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος). The so-called accusative absolute does not occur in the New Testament, unless Acts 26:3 (γνώστην ὄντα) be an example. Cf. also τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6). In Acts 2:29 ἐστίν is probably to be supplied with ἐξόν. Cf. ἐξὸν ἦν in Matt. 12:4 and δέον ἐστίν in Acts 19:36. Sometimes the genitive absolute is found where there is a noun or pronoun in the sentence for it to agree with. So ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ (Matt. 1:20). See also Matt. 21:23. Cf. the nominative absolute in Rev. 2:26, ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν δώσω αὐτῷ. The participle sometimes carries on the sentence loosely without a verb as ὑποτασσόμενοι (Eph. 5:21). In Mk. 7:19 καθαρίζων is due to anacoluthon. Cf. Rev. Sometimes the genitive absolute is used without a noun or pronoun as ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος (Lu. 12:36).

10. The Septuagint uses the participle as one translation of the Hebrew infinitive absolute as an intensive expression. This reappears in the New Testament as εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε (Heb. 6:14). Cf. θανάτῳ τελευτάτω (Matt. 15:4), another method used to translate

the same Hebrew idiom. So also παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν (Acts 5:28).

11. As to adjuncts with the circumstantial participle, they do not alter the true force of the participle at all, but merely sharpen and make clear the idea. So εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθύς (Mk. 6:25); ἅμα ἐλπίζων (Acts 24:26); καίπερ ὤν (Heb. 5:8); ὡς (giving the alleged reason which may or may not be true), as Lu. 16:1 (ὡς διασκορπίζων); 2 Cor. 5:20 (ὡς παρακαλοῦντος); Acts 27:30 (ὡς μελλοντων); ὥσπερ φερομένης (Acts 2:2). Cf. σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας (Lu. 22:32).

12. The participle in indirect discourse was sufficiently treated in the chapter on that subject. One example may suffice here, ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα (Lu. 4:23). In Eph. 5:5 (ἴστε γινώσκοντες) the participle has an intensive force and is hardly in indirect discourse. Note both verbs for knowing here used (οἶδα, γινώσκω).

13. The voice in the participle calls for nothing distinctive. The voice as in the infinitive merely follows the routine verbal function. Moulton (*Prolegomena*, p. 203) even says that the infinitive has "no voice distinction." That was true originally, but the Greek infinitive and the participle did come to have both voice and tense. Take ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι (Matt. 10:22) as an example of the periphrastic future passive. Note ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9) where middle and active combine in the periphrastic future.

14. The tense in the participle, however, calls for some discussion. Like the infinitive the participle has no time in itself. It gets its time from the verb with which it is used. Thus an aorist participle may be used with a future verb as ὁ ὑπομείνας σωθήσεται (Matt. 10:22), a future participle with a past tense of the indicative as ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων (Acts 8:27). Time with the participle is purely relative. The aorist participle is very common and is either simultaneous as κατήντησαν ἀσπασάμενοι (Acts 25:13) or antecedent as πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν (Acts 4:37). The aorist participle does not express subsequent action. The present participle gets its time from the principal verb and expresses incompleted action. So πωλοῦντες ἔφερον (Acts 4:34). In Jo. 9:25 (τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω) by the use of ἄρτι with the verb the present participle is made to have the force of an "imperfect" participle. The present parti-

ciple likewise may be used with the future tense as ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι (Matt. 10:22). In Acts 25:10 we have ἑστὼς εἰμι as a periphrastic present, not perfect in idea though so in form. The perfect participle accents the idea of completion as κεκοπιακὼς (Jo. 4:6), εἰληφὼς (Matt. 25:24, cf. λαβὼν in verse 20). The future participle, it should be added, is very rare in the New Testament and almost entirely in Luke. The article is occasionally found with the future participle as τὸ ἐσόμενον (Lu. 22:49). The future tense of the participle was more developed in the Boeotian dialect. In Eph. 4:18 we have a periphrastic perfect participle, ἐσκοτισμένοι ὄντες.

15. The negative of the participle in the New Testament is μή, unless a very emphatic negative is desired, when οὐ is used. In the older Greek οὐ was the common negative with participles, and μή only in special cases when condition or concession was suggested. In the modern Greek μή is alone used with participles. The New Testament usage shows the progress in that direction. Thus in Acts 17:6 μὴ εὑρόντες is in accord with the common usage of the later Greek. The papyri give some examples of οὐ as we have in the New Testament. Perhaps Luke and Paul respond to the old Greek feeling for οὐ to some extent. In general οὐ is only found with the participle when a distinct and strong negative is desired. So in Lu. 6:42 οὐ βλέπων. In 1 Pet. 1:8 we have οὐκ ἰδόντες and μὴ ὁρῶντες and the distinction can be seen.

16. Sometimes the participle like other adjectives, becomes a substantive (cf. τὸ ἀγαθόν, for instance). In Matt. 19:21 the possessive genitive is used with it, πώλησον σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα. Cf. the belongings in English. In Heb. 8:9 the participle is almost like the infinitive, but here it is to be taken as agreeing with μου after all, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν. Cf. Heb. 11:32, ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. Greek has two negatives that are used either simply (οὐ, μή) or in various compounds (οὐδέ, οὔτε, οὐδείς, οὐθείς, οὐκέτι, οὔποτε, etc., and so for compounds of μή, μηδέ, etc.). Latin has three negatives (*non*, *ne*, *haud*). The Sanskrit has *na* and *ma*. Greek did not use *na* (*ne*) and Latin did not use μή (*ma*). *Haud* and οὐ are probably the same word (cf. Zend *ava*). In the Boeotian dialect οὐ never was employed. In Homer indeed μή was freely used with the indicative and οὐ sometimes with the subjunctive. The history of οὐ and μή has been the constant increase of the use of μή. In the modern Greek δέν (for οὐδέν) is only used with the indicative. Perhaps the earliest use of μή was to express prohibition. For the form οὐθέν see 1 Cor. 13:2; Acts 19:27.

2. In general the New Testament uses the negative οὐ and μή in accordance with the idiom of the earlier Greek. The distinction is well observed between the outright negation by οὐ and the subtle and subjective μή. In the Sanskrit the same distinction existed between *na* and *ma*. In English we have to depend on the tone of voice for the difference, but we all know the difference between "no" and "no." Οὐ is direct, positive, categorical, definite; μή is doubtful, indirect, indefinite, hypothetical. Μή is a negative with a "string tied to it." If a girl should say οὐ to a proposal of marriage (especially οὐχί), there would be little hope. But μή would leave room for another trial. The bluntness of οὐ in its strengthened form οὐχί is well shown in Luke 1:60. On the other hand μήτι in Jo. 4:29 (μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;) but dimly conceals the woman's real conviction about Jesus.

3. With the imperative therefore μή is the logical, even the necessary, negative as μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε (Lu. 11:7). This is uniform

except where parenthetic clauses or sharp contrast is brought out (cf. infinitive). In 1 Pet. 3:3 after ἔστω οὐχ is set over against ἀλλ'. So also in 1 Pet. 2:18 we have οὐ μόνον . . . . ἀλλὰ καί. But in Jas. 1:22 (as elsewhere) μὴ μόνον is read. In 1 Cor. 5:10 οὐ πάντως is a parenthetical expansion of μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι. So in 2 Tim. 2:14 as to ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον and μὴ λογομαχεῖν. In Matt. 5:37 οὒ οὔ is the predicate of ἔστω and with the accented form instead of οὐ. In Rev. 22:9 (ὅρα μή) μή is a conjunction used without the verb. Cf. our "lookout."

4. With the subjunctive μή is also naturally the negative. But in Homer, before the subjunctive was sharply differentiated from the future indicative οὐ was sometimes employed with the subjunctive. The truth seems to be that μή displaced οὐ with the subjunctive, just as it did finally with the participle. Let μὴ δῶμεν (Mk. 12:14) serve as an example. Cf. Jo. 11:50. Οὐ, however, is used with the subjunctive, when μή is a conjunction, for the sake of distinction. So φοβοῦμαι μή πως ἐλθὼν οὐχ οἵους θέλω εὕρω ὑμᾶς (2 Cor. 12:20). So also the marginal reading of WH in Matt. 25:9 (μήποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ), but the text has μήποτε οὐ μή.

5. With the optative both οὐ and μή appear in the older Greek, οὐ in the conclusion of the fourth class condition, elsewhere μή. As a matter of fact the optative in the New Testament has no negative save in the case of wishes where it is always μή. So μὴ γένοιτο (Rom. 3:4).

6. The negative of the infinitive in the New Testament is μή, even in indirect discourse (Mk. 12:18, μὴ εἶναι), save in fixed phrases, repeated negatives, or when single words are negatived. In Mk. 7:24 οὐ is used much like ancient idiom in indirect discourse, οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι. But in Lu. 20:40 the compound negative of the infinitive is repeated like that of the principal verb, οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν. In Rom. 15:20 οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός is a parenthetic clause with εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. So καὶ οὐ after δουλεύειν (Rom. 7:6). Usually we have οὐ μόνον with the infinitive as in Jo. 11:52 with ἀποθνήσκειν. For the peculiar position of οὐ μόνον see Rom. 4:12,16. The New Testament does not use μὴ οὐ with the infinitive, but simply μή. So with a verb

of hindering, μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς (Acts 14:18). But μή (redundant μή) is not necessary in this use of the infinitive as ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν (Rom. 15:22). When the principal verb of hindering is negative, the simple infinitive is used as in μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν (Matt. 19:14) or μή may be employed as μή τι τὸ ὕδωρ δύναται κωλῦσαί τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι (Acts 10:47). Note τοῦ sometimes. In 1 Cor. 14:39 observe τὸ λαλεῖν μὴ κωλύετε. In Acts 4:20 both negatives retain their value, οὐ δυνάμεθα γὰρ . . . . μὴ λαλεῖν.

7. With participles μή is commonly used contrary to ancient custom, but not contrary to the undefined action of the participle; for instance, Matthew has μή with the participle 18 times and οὐ 2, Luke has μή 28 times and οὐ 2, John has μή 11 and οὐ 1. See the difference between οὐ with the participle and μή with the participle in 1 Pet. 1:8, οὐκ ἰδόντες and μὴ ὁρῶντες, one a definite case, the other a general statement. With the article and the participle μή is also the usual construction as τὰ μὴ διώκοντα (Rom. 9:30), but οὐ appears for a strong negative as in τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην (Rom. 9:25). Cf. τὸν οὐ λαόν in the same verse. Cf. ὁ οὐκ ὤν (Jo. 10:12). In the modern Greek μή alone is used with the participle.

8. With the indicative the matter is much more complicated. In the modern Greek δέν is confined to the indicative, and μή is used elsewhere. But the New Testament still uses μή a good deal with the indicative, though less than in the older Greek. A study of the various aspects of the indicative must therefore be made.

(a) In ordinary declarative sentences (simple or compound) the negative of the indicative is οὐ. This is in direct harmony with the idea of the mode. So ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται (Jo. 3:18).

(b) In causal sentences likewise οὐ is always found unless the reason is subjective or regarded as specially speculative. The only example of ὅτι μή in the New Testament is in Jo. 3:18, ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν. With this compare 1 Jo. 5:10 where ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν is read, the usual idiom. Cf. also Heb. 9:17 ἐπεὶ μὴ τότε ἰσχύει, which may, however, be a question.

(c) Conditional sentences usually had εἰ μή and εἰ οὐ rarely in

the older Greek. In conditions of the second class (determined as unfulfilled) εἰ μή is uniform even in the New Testament (as εἰ μὴ ἦν, etc., Jo. 9:33) except in Mk. 14:21 (Matt. 26:24) where we find εἰ οὐ. Here εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη brings out strongly the force of οὐ. But in first class conditions (fulfilled), leaving out the elliptical use of εἰ μή (Mk. 9:9) and εἰ μὴ δέ, εἰ οὐ is much more frequent in the New Testament than εἰ μή. In the older Greek εἰ οὐ was used when a single word was negatived or there was sharp contrast. Such examples occur in the New Testament as εἴ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει (Rom. 8:9), εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς . . . . οὐκ ἐφείσατο (Rom. 11:21). So εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐντρέπομαι (Lu. 18:4). Cf. Jas. 1:23 (καὶ οὐ ποιητής), 1 Cor. 9:2 (εἰ οὐκ εἰμί). Cf. Jo. 1:25.

(d) In relative sentences with the indicative οὐ is the usual negative as ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει (Matt. 10:38). But a few examples of μή appear in indefinite relative sentences as ἃ μὴ δεῖ (Tit. 1:11), ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα (2 Pet. 1:9). So also text of 1 Jo. 4:3 (WH), ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ (mar. ὃ λύει). Cf. ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν (1 Jo. 4:6).

(e) With expressions of purpose μή is the usual negative as ἵνα μὴ φυσιοῦσθε (1 Cor. 4:6), σκόπει μὴ ἐστίν (Lu. 11:35), βλέπετε μή ποτε ἔσται (Heb. 3:12).

(f) With verbs of fearing οὐ is the negative after μή, but no example occurs in the New Testament save 2 Cor. 12:20 where μή . . . . οὐ is found with the subjunctive. In Greek as in Latin μή (as *ne*) follows the verb of fearing for the positive idea.

(g) In questions μή expects the answer "no" as Mk. 14:19 (μή τι ἐγώ;), while οὐ requires the answer "yes" as Lu. 17:17 (οὐχ οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρίσθησαν;). In 1 Cor. 9:8 we have both in different parts of the same question, μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει; cf. also μὴ ἀπώσατο (Rom. 11:1) and οὐκ ἀπώσατο (Rom. 11:2). Sometimes οὐ μή is found in questions as οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό; (Jo. 18:11) where the answer is in accordance with οὐ. The negatives do not, of course, express the wide range of feeling and emotion in different situations. In a question like μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν; (1 Cor. 9:4) μή is the negative of the question and οὐκ of ἔχομεν.

(h) When the indicative is used in prohibitions οὐ occurs as in οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις (Matt. 5:33) or οὐ μή as in οὐ μὴ ἔσται (Matt. 16:22).

(i) In indirect discourse, where the indicative is used, the negative of the direct is retained as *πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν* (Matt. 16:11). Burton (*Moods and Tenses*, p. 181) properly notes the redundant *οὐ* after the verb "deny," *ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν* (1 Jo. 2:22). Cf. French *ne*.

(j) The succession of negatives in Greek merely strengthens the first negative if the second is a compound form like *οὐδέ*, *μηδείς*, etc. This use (just like the old English idiom that survives here and there) is not remarkably frequent, yet a number of examples occur as *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν* (Lu. 4:2), *μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε* (Rom. 13:8). Even three or more negatives may be found as *οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὔπω κείμενος* (Lu. 23:53), *οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω* (Mk. 14:25). But sometimes *τις* follows *οὐ* as *οὐχ ἁρπάσει τις* (Jo. 10:28). Cf. 1 Thess. 1:8.

(k) But when the second negative is a single negative, it retains its force. So *οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος* (1 Cor. 12:15); *οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἐργασίαν* (1 Cor. 9:6); *μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν* (Rom. 10:18); *ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν* (Jo. 3:18). Cf. *οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται* (Matt. 10:26), and *οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε . . . . ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται* (Matt. 24:2). See 1 Cor. 6:9 (*οὐ . . . . οὐ*). Cf. also *μή ποτε οὐ μὴ* (or *μή ποτε οὐ*, mg.) in Matt. 25:9. In Matt. 13:29 *οὔ, μή ποτε . . . . ἐκριζώσητε* each negative has its full force. Cf. *μή, μή ποτε* (Mk. 14:2). Cf. Mk. 12:24 for *οὐ μή* in question and *μή* with participle.

(l) The use of *οὐ μή* calls for a special note. The usual construction is with the subjunctive as in *οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ* above (Matt. 24:2). The future indicative is read in *οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο* (Matt. 16:22) and is doubtless the correct text in *οὐ μὴ τιμήσει* (Matt. 15:6) and a few other places (Matt. 26:35; Mk. 14:31). No satisfactory explanation of the origin of this use of *οὐ μή* has been found. They do not neutralize each other, but each retains its force as in *μὴ οὐ* in questions (Rom. 10:18). Cf. *οὐ μή* in questions (Lu. 18:7, *οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ;*). Does this use throw any light on the problem?

(m) The redundant negative as in 1 Jo. 2:22 (see above) and Lu. 24:16 (*ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι*) after a verb of hindering (a

negative conception) appears stranger to us now than it would have done some generations ago before we dropped the repeated and double negatives in English. Compare Shakespeare on this point. Compare this vulgar sentence "Hain't nobody seen nothing of never a hat nowhere about here?" Cf. *οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω* (Heb. 13:5).

(n) The form *οὐχί* adds fresh point to the negative *οὐ*, especially when contrasted with *ἀλλά* as in Luke 1:60. The position of the negative may also give new emphasis as *μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε* (Jas. 3:1). In Rom. 3:9 *οὐ πάντως* means "by no means," but in 1 Cor. 15:51 (*πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα*) *οὐ* goes with the verb. In Heb. 11:3 *μή* goes with the participle, not the infinitive. Litotes is not infrequent in the New Testament as *οὐ μετὰ πολλάς* (Acts 1:5)=*ὀλίγας*. Cf. Lu. 15:13.

(o) For *οὐχ ὅτι . . . . ἀλλά* see Jo. 7:22. For *οὐχ ἵνα . . . . ἀλλά* see Jo. 6:38. For *ἀλλ' οὐκ* in the apodosis of a condition see Mk. 14:29. For *οὐ μόνον . . . . ἀλλὰ καί* see Rom. 5:3. See Jo. 4:11 *οὔτε . . . . καί*. For *οὐδέ . . . . οὔτε* see Rev. 5:3, and *οὐδείς . . . . οὔτε* (Rev. 5:4). For *οὐδέ . . . . οὐδέ* see Rev. 9:4. For *μηδὲ . . . . μηδέ* see Matt. 10:9. For *μήτε . . . . μήτε* see Acts 27:20. For *οὔτε . . . . οὔτε* see Matt. 12:32. For *μηδέ . . . . ἀλλά* see 1 Pet. 5:2.

As is usual in ancient Greek, *καὶ οὐ* (Col. 2:9,19), not *οὐδέ*, follows affirmative clauses.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

INTENSIVE PARTICLES.

1. The term particle, as Winer well observes (Thayer's edition, p. 356), has never been satisfactorily delimited. In one sense all adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections are particles. They are nearly all originally adverbs. They belong to the development of the sentence from simple to complex.

2. Intensive particles have usually a very obscure origin. The etymology of most of them is unknown, but they are as a rule very old. Indeed the New Testament writers do not use them with anything like the frequency of the older Greek writers. But when the intensive particles are used in the New Testament they deserve notice.

3. The Greeks not simply had fine shades of thought and emotion, but they preferred to express them in the sentence by the particle. In modern languages such distinction and emphasis depend upon the voice and manner. Compare a German's use of his hands in speaking and a Frenchman shrugging his shoulders, etc. The New Testament Greek is more like the English and leaves most of this emotion to be brought out by the reader himself.

4. Γέ (enclitic) is of very doubful etymology (cf. Doric γά, Sanskrit *gha*, and ἄγαν). It is used thirty-three times in the New Testament. It usually occurs with some other particle like ἀλλά γε (1 Cor. 9:2), ἄρα γε (Matt. 7:20), ἁρά γε (Acts 8:30), εἴ γε (Gal. 3:4), εἰ δὲ μή γε (Matt. 6:1), καί γε (Acts 17:27), καίτοι γε (Jo. 4:2), μενοῦνγε (Rom. 10:18), μήτιγε (1 Cor. 6:3). In Phil. 3:8 note ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν γε καί. In itself γε adds nothing to the sense save by way of intensifying the idea of the word or clause. This may be to minify as in Jo. 4:2 or to magnify as in Rom. 8:32.

5. Πέρ (enclitic) is probably a shortening up of περί (cf. perfect) and so would have the idea of thoroughly. But others get it from πέραν. In the New Testament we find it with ὅς in the Text. Rec. of Mk. 15:6, but WH have dropped it. Elsewhere it only occurs with the particles διόπερ (1 Cor. 8:13), ἐάνπερ (Heb. 3:14), εἴπερ (Rom. 8:9), ἐπειδήπερ (Lu. 1:1), ἥπερ (Jo. 12:43, text of WH, mg. ὑπέρ), καθάπερ (Rom. 3:4), καίπερ (Heb. 12:17), ὥσπερ (Matt. 6:2). The idea is uniformly the same.

6. Δή (surely, therefore, possibly shortened form of ἤδη) is used sparingly in the New Testament but in harmony with the ancient idiom. The simple form appears five (possibly six, Acts 6:3 mg.) times and with the same idea each time. See 1 Cor. 6:20, δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν. Once we have δή που (Heb. 2:16). The passage with δή ποτε (Jo. 5:4), has dropped out of the critical text.

7. Τοί is of uncertain origin; either the locative of the demonstrative τός (on this ground) or the ethical epic dative τοί (σοί). In the New Testament it does not occur alone, but is found in composition. So ἤτοι once (Rom. 6:16) καίτοι twice (Acts 14:17; Heb. 4:3), μέντοι eight times (as Jo. 4:27), τοιγαροῦν twice (1 Thess. 4:8; Heb. 12:1), τοίνυν three times (Lu. 20:25; 1 Cor. 9:26; Heb. 13:13).

8. Μέν is from epic μήν, older epic and Doric μάν. Ἦ μήν became ἦ μέν, and then μέν. It means surely, of a truth. Μέν is far the most common of the intensive particles in the New Testament, but it is nothing like so frequent as in the older Greek. All degrees of emphasis are presented by this particle, from the slightest emphasis (Acts 17:12) to sharp contrast (Matt. 3:11). The contrast even with δέ is often very slight and not to be translated. The original use by itself still survives in the New Testament as in 2 Cor. 11:4 (εἰ μὲν γάρ) where is no thought of a corresponding δέ or ἀλλά. So Acts 5:41 (οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο). Μενοῦν is found once (Lu. 11:28), μενοῦνγε three times (Rom. 9:20; 10:18; Phil. 3:8), μέντοι eight times (see above).

9. The affirmative particle ναί is found over thirty times, simply as yes (Matt. 13:51), or meaning verily or yea (Matt. 11:9) in

contrast with οὔ (Matt. 5:37), with the article as subject (2 Cor. 1:17).

10. *νή* as a strong affirmation with the accusative is found only once, *καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν* (1 Cor. 15:31). Μά does not occur at all.

CHAPTER XXXV.

FIGURES OF SPEECH.

1. These are not as a rule peculiarities of Greek idiom, but belong to the nature of speech and so occur in the New Testament as a matter of course. The mind does not work like a machine. Speech is merely the expression of thought. Hence it is not strange that the lapses, interruptions, and sudden changes in mental processes should be enbalmed in language. They are especially frequent in popular speech and the language of passion. On both grounds the New Testament furnishes numerous examples of broken structure. Paul shows much emotion and especially in 2 Corinthians does his language struggle for expression. One can almost hear his heart beat there.

2. In Revelation there are grammatical lapses due to various reasons. Some are on purpose as in the case of ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν (Rev. 1:4) to accent the unchangeableness of God. Note also in the same sentence ὁ ἦν. Others are due to the vividness of conception in the book as καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ εἴληφεν (Rev. 5:7). Cf. also Rev. 10:8-10. This mixing of tenses is common also in Mark. The use of cases without regular accord is found elsewhere, but is more common in Revelation. So τῆς καινῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα (Rev. 3:12). The visions add to the excitement and confusion. Cf. nominative and accusative in Rev. 4:1,4. It is possible that the book may have been dictated and probably like 2 Peter lacked careful critical revision. But these non-literary traits, some of which appear in the non-literary papyri, do not prove the author an ignoramus.

3. Some examples of the leading figures of speech may be given. Ellipsis of the copula εἰσίν is seen in Matt. 5:3 (μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί) and of τινές before τῶν μαθητῶν (Acts 21.16). Brachylogy is shown in χάρις τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑπηκούσατε δέ (Rom. 6:17).

Zeugma is well illustrated by γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα (1 Cor. 3:2). Aposiopesis is found in εἰ ἔγνως ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην (Lu. 19:42). A good example of anacoluthon appears 1 Cor. 9:15 (Οὐκ ἔγραψα δέ ταῦτα ἵνα οὕτως γένηται ἐν ἐμοί, καλὸν γάρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ- τὸ καύχημά μου οὐδεὶς κενώσει). Paranomasia is used in ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν (Heb. 5:8). Annominatio is found in μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους (2 Thess. 3:11). Pleonasm is exhibited in ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς (Mk. 7:25). Hyperbaton we see in Heb. 7:4 (Θεωρεῖτε πηλίκος οὗτος ᾧ). There are a few poetical quotations in the New Testament as Acts 17:28; 1 Cor. 15:33; Titus 1:12, and in Heb. (12:13) a hexameter line is found in some MSS. but WH read ποιεῖτε instead of ποιήσατε and we lose the hexameter. In Matt. 6:28 prolepsis of the subject is found as very often in the New Testament, καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνουσιν.

4. Rhythm meant much to the Greek, but it is difficult for us always to appreciate (see position of αὐτοῦ, σου, and μου in John 9:7,10,11). It has been denied that there was any rhythm in the New Testament writers. It is not probably to be found according to Attic standards, but the later Greek writers in general except the Atticists had different tastes in such matters. The New Testament writers are not artificial. What rhythm they have is chiefly due to passion and exaltation of spirit. So especially in Paul, Hebrews, and John.

5. The New Testament writers do not use the stately periods of the Attic orators and historians with their long rolling sentences. But sometimes shorter sentences in the New Testament deserve the name of period. See Lu. 1:1-4, Heb. 1:1-4, Acts 1:1-3, 2 Thess. 1:3-10, Eph. 1:3-14.

6. The words in a Greek sentence were arranged for rhetorical effect rather than according to stiff rules (not like Latin). In the Greek sentence the most emphatic position was the beginning or end of the clause. Cf. ἤδη . . . κεῖται (Matt. 3:10) and οὐ in 1 Cor. 1:17. The Greek genius was freedom and life. In this was its glory, and, when tempered by the Hebrew spirituality, the Greek became the best vehicle of the world for the expression of God's

revelation in human speech. The Greek Testament remains the treasure of the ages, and should be the *vade mecum* of the preacher that he may come *εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι.*

INDEX TO NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES.

(Books in order of Westcott and Hort.)

MATTHEW.

	PAGE		PAGE
1:2	80	3:11	38, 105, 106, 120, 143, 206
1:11	100	3:12	110
1:12	73, 99, 100	3:14	14, 141
1:16	18	3:15	135, 140, 176
1:17	102, 171	3:16	119, 166
1:18	104	3:17	74, 91, 138, 193
1:19	157, 160	3:34	106
1:20	104, 112, 196	4:1	124
1:21	78, 143, 149	4:2	28
1:22	72, 102, 124	4:3	73
1:23	102	4:6	149
1:27	79	4:7	145
2:2	113, 189	4:11	112
2.3	20, 24, 77	4:15	94
2:4	105, 140	4:17	195
2:6	120	4:18	122
2:8	173	4:19	117
2:9	171	4:21	95
2:13	103, 153, 189, 192	4:25	105
2:16	149	5:1	70, 118, 120
2:18	157	5:3	107, 208
2:20	24	5:8	107
2:22	103, 153	5:13	124, 164, 166
3:1	76, 140	5:14	117
3:2	122, 143	5:15	11, 98
3:4	79	5:16	105, 116
3:5	98	5:17	138, 140, 148, 191
3:6	25, 66, 108, 120, 141	5:19	128
3:7	121, 178	5:21	41, 67, 112
3:8	102	5:22	78. 101, 117, 169, 194
3:10	140, 149, 209	5:25	45, 140, 171, 172

5:28 . . . . . 102, 148
5:29 . . . . . 105, 119
5:33 203
5:34 189
5:36 36
5:37 . . . . . 200, 207
5:38 119
5:39 169
5:42 132
5:43 129
5:45 70
5:46 79
6:1 . . . . . 113, 205
6:2 . . . . . 124, 140, 152, 176, 206
6:5 . . . . . 143, 176
6:7 176
6:8 172
6:10 . . . . . 47, 121
6:12 112
6:13 . . . . . 66, 119, 131
6:16 . . . . . 194, 195
6:18 152
6:19 80
6:24 . . . . . 85, 148, 189
6:25 . . . . . 112, 181, 185
6:26 105
6:28 . . . . . 179, 209
6:29 104
6:30 118
6:31 . . . . . 181, 185
7:3f 80, 83
7:4 132
7:6 112
7:9 . . . . . 95, 179
7:11 . . . . . 189, 194
7:12 . . . . . 82, 170, 191
7:14 83
7:15 . . . . . 26, 160
7:20 205
7:21 85
7:22 76
7:24 . . . . . 77, 121
7:25 . . . . . 41, 146
7:26 77
7:28 173
8:1 196
8:3 . . . . . 52, 181
8:4 81
8:8 79
8:12 27
8:13 18
8:18 98
8:19 68
8:20 70
8:24 78
8:27 156
8:28 121
8:32 121
8:34 77
8:35 169
9:4 . . . . . 83, 120, 178, 179
9:5 . . . . . 178, 179
9:10 184
9:11 . . . . . 83, 178
9:15 174
9:18 138
9:22 21
9:24 . . . . . 103, 141
9:25 103
9:28 150
9:30 . . . . . 41, 85
9:31 . . . . . 132, 150
9:38 135
10:2 72
10:5 100
10:8 97
10:9 . . . . . 135, 204
10:10 149
10:14 . . . . . 105, 116
10:16 77
10:18 102
10:19 84
10:22 . . . . . 81, 143, 197, 198
10:24 124

10:25 . . . . . 66, 113
10:26 . . . . . 96, 135, 203
10:28 . . . . . 119, 135
10:29 . . . . . 85, 116
10:33 169
10:38 202
11:1 195
11:3 123
11:7 187
11:9 206
11:10 180
11:11 . . . . . 27, 104
11:13 41
11:14 . . . . . 37, 142
11:21 . . . . . 163, 180
11:23 . . . . . 117, 172
11:26 . . . . . 77, 92
11:28 . . . . . 84, 96, 118, 131
12:1 . . . . . 17, 107
12:4 196
12:10 179
12:13 41
12:21 . . . . . 38, 143
12:24 120
12:25 79
12:27 . . . . . 161, 162
12:28 . . . . . 138, 149, 162
12:31 101
12:32 204
12:33 148
12:36 70
12:41 120
12:42 22
12:45 28
13:6 72
13:12 81
13:13 37
13:29 . . . . . 111, 116, 203
13:32 155
13:33 171
13:34 . . . . . 105, 117
13:35 98
13:38 63
13:46 145
13:51 . . . . . 177, 206
13:55 18
14:3 103
14:13 106
14:17 22
14:18 69
14:22 . . . . . 171, 186, 192
14:25 107
14:31 103
15:4 . . . . . 109, 196
15:6 203
15:14 118
15:18 81
15:23 . . . . . 36, 117
15:25 112
15:27 105
15:28 . . . . . 176, 180
15:32 . . . . . 84, 91
16:1 74
16:9 . . . . . 22, 102
16:11 203
16:16 73
16:18 . . . . . 72, 90
16:19 146
16:22 . . . . . 26, 143, 203
16:23 57
16:26 96
17:4 . . . . . 112, 191
17:5 180
17:12 11
17:17 178
17:25 195
18:1 27
18:4 82
18:6 153
18:8 . . . . . 113, 188
18:12 112
18:13 164
18:15 164
18:19 81

18:20 73
18:25 . . . . . 148, 186
18:26 112
19:6 149
19:14 . . . . . 189, 201
19:18 71
19:21 . . . . . 183, 198
19:22 196
19:34 189
20:1 66
20:2 94
20:6 94
20:10 184
20:12 109
20:14 158
20:19 107
20:22 84
20:28 . . . . . 58, 102, 119
20:30 98
20:32 154
21:1 24
21:2 117
21:8 . . . . . 24, 63, 80
21:21 72
21:22 170
21:23 . . . . . 149, 189
21:24 95
21:30 122
21:31 83
21:32 189
21:33 196
21:37 96
21:38 179
21:41 . . . . . 38, 120, 143
21:46 95
22:16 60
23:2 138
23:5 154
23:17 83
23:23 . . . . . 129, 141, 162
23:27 . . . . . 20, 102, 109
23:30 163
23:31 110
23:33 131
23:34 22
23:35 102
23:37 97
24:2 203
24:3 179
24:10 85
24:20 100
24:21 67
24:24 154
24:33 . . . . . 108, 173
24:38 171
24:39 171
24:42 84
24:43 163
24:45 178
24:50 81
25:5 . . . . . 138, 141
25:6 . . . . . 77, 100
25:8 140
25:9 . . . . . 200, 203
25:16 41
25:20 . . . . . 145, 198
25:24 . . . . . 145, 198
25:27 129
25:34 104
25:35 46
25:38 179
25:40 159
26:2 72
26:9 103
26:15 148
26:18 . . . . . 76, 81, 98, 140
26:22 85
26:23 . . . . . 108, 120
26:24 . . . . . 162, 202
26:33 162
26:35 203
26:42 167
26:43 146
26:50 . . . . . 84, 178

26:51 100
26:53 76
26:55 . . . . . 121, 141
26:61 119
27:4 46
27:5 135
27:10 175
27:13 103
27:17 . . . . . 83, 142
27:21 104
27:22 95
27:24 . . . . . 78, 129, 131, 135, 143
27:30 141
27:33 140
27:40 73
27:43 73
27:44 123
27:46 . . . . . 20, 76, 92
27:49 . . . . . 131, 143
27:54 . . . . . 72, 73
27:61 116
28:1 . . . . . 28, 117
28:15 102

MARK.

1:2 154
1:4 . . . . . 101, 120
1:7 189
1:8 . . . . . 78, 107
1:9 120
1:10 . . . . . 105, 121
1:13 122
1:14 174
1:15 111
1:16 118
1:18 109
1:21 174
1:24 . . . . . 84, 113, 178
1:29 18
1:34 36
2:1 100
2:15 185
2:16 178
2:17 153
2:19 . . . . . 172, 174
2:22 166
2:23 148
2:28 155
3:1 75
3:8 117
3:11 173
3:14 119
3:24 164
3:29 102
4:23 82
4:26 176
4:31 105
4:37 155
4:38 141
4:39 . . . . . 45, 145
5:4 . . 72, 110, 119, 124, 145, 160, 192
5:5 119
5:13 141
5:14 . . . . . 185, 194
5:19 . . . . . 145, 179
5:21 . . . . . 73, 81
5:22 123
5:23 154
5:34 . . . . . 21, 92
5:39 139
5:41 . . . . . 77, 92
5:42 139
5:43 192
6:2 76
6:4 26
6:8 186
6:11 . . . . . 105, 117
6:16 81
6:19 110
6:21 107
6:23 26

6:25 197
6:36 177
6:38 . . . . . 84, 178
6:39 191
6:40 91
6:45 171
6:48 . . . . . 113, 172
6:51 123
6:56 . . . . . 128, 169, 175
7:5 74
7:19 . . . . . 64, 196
7:24 200
7:25 209
7:31 98
7:36 27
8:7 36
8:12 166
8:22 153
8:28 181
8:34 169
8:35 169
8:37 42
8:38 96
9:6 . . . . . 181, 185
9:7 102
9:9 . . . . . 152, 202
9:11 . . . . . 83, 178
9:12 112
9:20 112
9:22 36
9:23 71
9:28 . . . . . 41, 178
9:29 83
9:30 153
9:38 168
9:40 124
9:41 96
9:42 122
9:47 59
10:13 112
10:17 83
10:18 . . . . . 59, 178
10:29 170
10:30 . . . . . 122, 164
10:35 131
10:37 85
10:38 96
10:40 71
10:42 103
10:43 131
10:48 110
10:51 118
11:14 . . . . . 45, 157
11:19 128
11:21 14
11:22 101
11:23 141
11:24 138
11:25 . . . . . 121, 173
11:28 84
11:31 112
12:1 35
12:14 200
12:15 177
12:17 . . . . . 72, 101
12:18 . . . . . 183, 191, 200
12:24 203
12:37 73
12:41 141
13:15 . . . . . 44, 132
13:16 . . . . . 108, 120
13:19 82
13:20 119
13:30 172
13:36 152
14:2 . . . . . 152, 203
14:4 178
14:9 202
14:12 154
14:14 . . . . . 170, 186
14:19 . . . . . 28, 116, 202
14:20 108
14:21 202
14:25 203

14:28 190
14:29 204
14:31 203
14:32 172
14:36 . . . . . 77, 92
14:41 63
14:43 122
14:44 146
14:47 . . . . . 83, 135
14:61 141
14:65 135
14:72 141
15:4 . . . . . 84, 179
15:6 . . . . . 141, 206
15:16 . . . . . 81, 117
15:17 95
15:23 141
15:24 . . . . . 83, 85, 178
15:29 180
15:44 . . . . . 145, 166
15:47 179
16:9 . . . . . 28, 146

LUKE.

1:1 159
1:3 12
1:5 82
1:6 . . . . . 74, 116
1:8 . . . . . 111, 184
1:9 189
1:13 159
1:15 116
1:20 . . . . . 81, 143, 160
1:21 141
1:22 . . . . . 78, 141, 145
1:23 . . . . . 148, 151, 173
1:26 151
1:30 138
1:36 . . . . . 26, 27
1:41 . . . . . 102, 184
1:59 141
1:60 . . . . . 63, 199, 204
1:62 . . . . . 177, 185
1:66 179
1:73 95
1:74 112
1:76 189
2:1 184
2:4 . . . . . 81, 160
2:5 135
2:7 112
2:8 95
2:13 111
2:14 72
2:15 85
2:16 147
2:20 81
2:22 98
2:27 . . . . . 97, 102
2:35 . . . . . 100, 105
2:38 107
2:41 107
2:46 98
2:48 . . . . . 12, 139
2:49 . . . . . 83, 178, 179
2:50 83
3:2 121
3:10 . . . . . 131, 178
3:15 186
3:16 106
3:21 185
4:2 203
4:3 162
4:6 145
4:13 . . . . . 76, 116, 171
4:14 121
4:18 116
4:20 . . . . . 70, 79
4:23 197
4:28 196
4:29 . . . . . 146, 155, 191
4:34 . . . . . 179f

4:41 63
4:42 189
5:4 194
5:9 81
5:10 . . . . . 71, 112
5:12 105
5:17 . . . . . 146, 148
5:19 . . . . . 67, 100, 117
5:20 39
5:21 80
5:23 145
5:32 145
5:38 . . . . . 97, 194
6:1 . . . . . 148, 185
6:3 173
6:8 78
6:9 107
6:11 . . . . . 44, 185
6:12 70
6:17 70
6:20 149
6:22 116
6:26 95
6:34 152
6:35 12
6:37 132
6:42 . . . . . 45, 121, 154, 198
7:1 173
7:4 170
7:9 82
7:12 . . . . . 113, 123
7:19 83
7:27 170
7:38 . . . . . 108, 110
7:39 . . . . . 163, 178
7:44 123
7:47 . . . . . 81, 82, 151
8:1 121
8:6 47
8:15 59
8:18 170
8:20 47
8:25 . . . . . 112, 156, 178, 179
8:26 117
8:27 109
8:29 . . . . . 24, 109, 146
8:38 50
8:39 121
8:46 184
9:7f 85
9:13 164
9:18 . . . . . 189, 190, 192
9:27 172
9:46 . . . . . 131, 165, 185
9:50 170
9:52 . . . . . 176, 191
9:54 . . . . . 64, 131
9:56 85
10:1 118
10:7 70
10:15 117
10:17 148
10:18 195
10:25 68
10:26 179
10:28 132
10:30 106
10:31f 119
10:34 103
10:35 . . . . . 31, 82, 183
10:38 96
10:40 . . . . . 122, 182
10:42 169
11:6 170
11:7 199
11:16 121
11:21 80
11:22 173
11:23 102
11:28 206
11:33 124
11:34 173
11:35 202
11:38 122

11:52 21
12:1 . . . . . 81, 82
12:3 . . . . . 82, 149
12:5 . . . . . 182, 186
12:8 . . . . . 143, 169
12:10 120
12:11 173
12:19 100
12:20 . . . . . 107, 190
12:25 104
12:32 92
12:35 . . . . . 45, 145
12:36 196
12:38 167
12:39 163
12:47 96
12:48 81
12:49 . . . . . 83, 179
12:50 79
12:52 146
12:58 192
13:3 167
13:7 173
13:8 172
13:10 195
13:16 24
13:19 80
13:23 166
13:25 173
13:26 42
13:28 . . . . . 42, 54
13:29 18
13:31 79
14:1 17
14:8 . . . . . 42, 145
14:18 . . . . . 145, 195
14:19 195
14:24 102
14:30 76
15:7 27
15:13 204
15:14 78
15:15 109
15:17 30
15:24 146
15:26 182
15:29 . . . . . 94, 112
16:1 . . . . . 160, 197
16:2 178
16:3 . . . . . 95, 143, 194
16:4 139
16:8 . . . . . 28, 101, 124
16:10 . . . . . 27, 74
16:12 83
16:13 . . . . . 23, 85, 102
16:20 . . . . . 41, 146
16:24 . . . . . 77, 100
16:25 46
16:26 . . . . . 117, 145
17:1 189
17:2 122
17:6 . . . . . 141, 163, 165
17:8 . . . . . 37, 46, 142
17:10 141
17:11 119
17:17 202
17:21 . . . . . 102, 116
17:27 . . . . . 141, 171
17:32 102
17:33 169
18:1 190
18:4 . . . . . 167, 202
18:5 183
18:7 . . . . . 107, 204
18:9 122
18:11 123
18:12 . . . . . 100, 141
18:13 70
18:14 81
18:31 112
18:36 185
19:2 79
19:3 85
19:4 . . . . . 67, 100

19:7 122
19:8 141
19:9 159
19:11 67
19:12 . . . . . 26, 79
19:13 . . . . . 76, 172
19:17 . . . . . 132, 141
19:18 85
19:20 85
19:21 153
19:23 166
19:40 . . . . . 39, 146, 162
19:42 209
19:44 119
19:47 67
19:48 53
20:4 148
20:6 . . . . . 145, 183
20:10 152
20:11 . . . . . 135, 192
20:12 7
20:13 135
20:28 26
20:40 200
20:42 79
21:11 147
21:19 143
21:24 171
21:25 . . . . . 72, 206
22:4 . . . . . 71, 131, 182, 186
22:6 . . . . . 105, 116
22:9 131
22:11 169
22:15 190
22:16 131
22:19 80
22:23 . . . . . 131, 141, 182, 186
22:24 . . . . . 141, 182, 186
22:27 71
22:42 . . . . . 46, 49
22:49 . . . . . 120, 166, 198
22:52 122
22:54 34
22:58 180
23:12 . . . . . 141, 195
23:15 . . . . . 110, 113
23:18 110
23:19 139
23:31 131
23:33 69
23:50 59
23:53 203
23:54 98
24:1 . . . . . 26, 107
24:4 . . . . . 148, 185
24:6 . . . . . 149, 184
24:10 100
24:11 112
24:16 . . . . . 105, 189
24:17 . . . . . 119, 139
24:18 66
24:19 63
24:20 . . . . . 152, 178, 179
24:23 183
24:24 175
24:25 78
24:26 141
24:30 190
24:31 78
24:39 20
24:41 119
24:46 192
24:51 119

JOHN.

1:1 . . . . . 75, 123
1:3 16
1:6 91
1:11 76
1:12 71
1:14 . . . . . 13, 67, 102

1:15 16
1:16 119
1:19 177
1:25 . . . . . 167, 202
1:27 170
1:29 180
1:41 66
1:42 . . . . . 73, 77
1:48 124
1:49 73
1:50 181
2:6 118
2:9 102
2:11 . . . . . 76, 80
2:18 149
2:19 132
2:20 . . . . . 41, 109, 138
2:23 120
2:24 . . . . . 30, 80, 160, 185
2:25 . . . . . 160, 177, 181
3:10 75
3:15 141
3:16 . . . . . 85, 155
3:18 . . . . . 159, 201, 203
3:19 148
3:22 148
3:23 116
3:25 122
4:2 205
4:3 129
4:5 . . . . . 102, 117
4:6 189
4:7 33
4:10 . . . . . 194, 195
4:11 . . . . . 63, 148, 149, 194, 204
4:15 149
4:19 182
4:20 120
4:23 . . . . . 63, 148
4:27 . . . . . 72, 206
4:29 . . . . . 178, 199
4:34 80
4:36 74
4:52 . . . . . 93, 94
5:4 . . . . . 83, 206
5:9 83
5:11 . . . . . 69, 81
5:19 164
5:20 12
5:23 100
5:25 73
5:30 79
5:35 81
5:36 . . . . . 13, 145
5:39 . . . . . 44, 129
5:45 . . . . . 40, 145
5:46 81
5:47 167
5:58 90
6:2 54
6:6 185
6:10 97
6:16-21 146
6:17 146
6:19 94
6:32 148
6:36 148
6:38 204
6:39 118
6:45 104
6:47 . . . . . 64, 66
6:51 148
6:67 178
6:69 71
7:6 74
7:8 80
7:13 98
7:17 . . . . . 37, 84, 142, 164, 179
7:21 16
7:22 204
7:37 . . . . . 50, 164
7:47 177
8:15 121
8:16 166

8:20 120
8:25 . . . . . 67, 83, 97
8:27 94
8:29 . . . . . 66, 113
8:39 165
8:42 38
8:44 55
8:51 164
8:53 66
8:57 40
9:6 79
9:7 209
9:9 109
9:10 . . . . . 79, 209
9:11 . . . . . 79, 209
9:17 79
9:18 . . . . . 31, 171, 181
9:25 197
9:32 184
9:33 202
9:34 77
9:39 148
10:11 . . . . . 71, 73
10:12 201
10:16 148
10:25 24
10:28 203
10:30 63
10:32 141
10:36 . . . . . 73, 181
10:37 167
10:38 . . . . . 138, 141
11:1 18
11:3 168
11:4 148
11:13 181
11:17 28
11:18 119
11:27 63
11:44 . . . . . 96, 146
11:47 129
11:49 83
11:50 . . . . . 124, 200
11:52 201
11:50 124
11:55 105
11:56 53
12:9 73
12:12 73
12:16 66
12:32 164
12:42 148
12:43 206
13:13 . . . . . 90, 181
13:14 175
13:16 104
13:17 164
13:20 169
13:21 151
13:22 151
13:23 151
13:24 . . . . . 151, 179
13:25 151
13:27 151
13:35 80
14:1 44
14:2 . . . . . 80, 166
14:3 . . . . . 37, 141
14:6 85
14:13 169
14:14 169
14:22 . . . . . 83, 179, 185
14:26 95
14:28 . . . . . 26, 163
14:29 172
15:12f 153
15:14 76
15:20 162
15:22 . . . . . 36, 162
15:24 . . . . . 36, 162
16:7 112
16:23 164
16:28 145
17:1 . . . . . 21, 91

17:4 79
17:5 79
17:6 145
17:7 . . . . . 39, 40
17:21 21
17:24 92
17:25 . . . . . 21, 92
18:5 146
18:6 106
18:11 202
18:19 122
18:23 162
18:30 . . . . . 163, 167
18:39 154
19:2 107
19:3 36
19:11 163
19:12 119
19:19 121
19:22 145
19:25 . . . . . 74, 108, 122
19:35 81
19:36 20
20:4 . . . . . 27, 66
20:8 66
20:11 . . . . . 108, 123
20:24 121
20:25 13
20:28 . . . . . 20, 92
21:8 106
21:18 141
21:21 179
21:22 171
21:23 . . . . . 120, 172
21:25 . . . . . 181, 192

ACTS.

1:1ff. 122
1:3 122
1:4 . . . . . 105, 181
1:5 . . . . . 76, 80, 107, 122, 204
1:11 76
1:13 124
1:15 146
1:22 81
1:25 80
2:2 . . . . . 160, 176, 197
2:17 38
2:25 41
2:29 196
2:29 190
2:33 114
2:38 120
2:45 175
2:46 147
3:2 . . . . . 36, 95
3:3 37
3:7 103
3:9 194
3:11 22
3:23 169
4:4 35
4:9 101
4:13 80
4:20 201
4:25 83
4:33 36
4:34 197
4:35 . . . . . 159, 175
4:36 109
4:37 197
5:2 18
5:5 196
5:24 179
5:28 197
5:36 . . . . . 14, 83, 112
5:38 164
5:41 . . . . . 69, 206
5:42 195
6:3 206
6:11 124

7:12 184
7:13 113
7:16 103
7:18 171
7:19 189
7:20 113
7:23 28
7:39 113
7:40 . . . . . 91, 112
7:43 117
8:1 117
8:11 109
8:20 157
8:21 149
8.23 184
8:27 . . . . . 154, 196, 197
8:30 . . . . . 118, 177, 205
8:31 . . . . . 149, 165
8:38f 120
8:40 190
9:1 102
9:3 112
9:6 . . . . . 84, 178
9:7 95
9:31 107
9:38 . . . . . 102, 116
10:1 18
10:3 93
10:5 122
10:17 182
10:18 206
10:28 183
10:34 . . . . . 59, 184
10:38 96
10:47 . . . . . 81, 201
11:16 107
11:17 162
11:19 121
11:26 60
11:28 . . . . . 37, 142, 192
12:2 110
12:6 . . . . . 123, 192
12:8 135
12:14 38
12:18 . . . . . 12, 179
13:6 102
13:10 92
13:20 109
13:25 . . . . . 83, 178
14:1 101
14:4 69
14:5 189
14:6 18
14:8 . . . . . 18, 107
14:16 106
14:17 206
14:18 . . . . . 194, 201
14:19 . . . . . 181, 192
14:22 186
14:23 146
15:15 . . . . . 40, 123
15:21 191
15:22f 64, 191
15:25 191
15:28 189
15:26 72
16:10 123
16:11 66
16:15 113
16:16 196
16:21 191
16:29 82
16:34 110
16:36 55
16:37 110
17:6 . . . . . 18, 198
17:12 206
17:15 176
17:18 . . . 80, 82, 83, 131, 165, 177, 182, 185
17:22 91
17:27 . . . . 44, 165, 179, 185, 196, 205
17:28 . . . . . 69, 209
18:3 94

18:4 141
18:10 189
18:14 . . . . . 91, 163
18:25 122
19:2 147
19:13 76
19:16 23
19:26 . . . . . 80, 99
19:27 199
19:32 . . . . . 85, 185
19:36 196
19:40 103
20:4 109
20:5 94
20:15 116
20:16 . . . . . 146, 166
20:18 77
20:24 152
20:25 189
20:28 75
20:35 78
21:1 20
21:4 186
21:9 28
21:16 . . . . . 101, 208
21:21 . . . . . 107, 186
21:26 71
21:28 . . . . . 109, 146
21:29 146
21:33 . . . . . 177, 182
21:38 75
22:8 14
22:9 95
22:12 105
22:16 . . . . . 14, 44, 132, 135
22:22 . . . . . 141, 162
22:25 18
22:29 184
23:5 95
23:9 166
23:20 . . . . . 123, 176
23:22 186
23:23 186
24:3 110
24:19 165
24:21 . . . . . 35, 76, 80
24:22 118
24:26 . . . . . 109, 110, 197
24:27 22
25:3 186
25:4 184
25:10 198
25:13 . . . . . 174, 197
25:16 . . . . . 172, 182, 183, 184
25:17 85
25:21 172
25:22 . . . . . 129, 158
25:24 186
25:25 184
25:26 185
26:3 . . . . . 98, 121, 196
26:4 . . . . . 39, 51
26:5 . . . . . 27, 66
26:19 113
26:20 186
26:24 75
26:29 . . . . . 84, 131, 157, 165, 166
26:32 . . . . . 162, 192
27:10 . . . . . 186, 192
27:17 153
27:18 141
27:20 . . . . . 189, 204
27:22 . . . . . 71, 94, 105
27:30 . . . . . 160, 197
21:34 105
27:39 . . . . . 165, 166
27:43 105
28:13 66
28:20 97
28:23 102
28:26 35

JAMES.

1:1 . . . . . 44, 191
1:2 . . . . . 77, 107
1:5 105
1:6 109
1:11 139
1:13 104
1:18 83
1:19 . . . . . 51, 131
1:22 200
1:23 202
1:24 . . . . . 84, 139, 145
2:5 113
2:10 169
2:25 . . . . . 106, 109
3:1 204
3:7 110
3:10 56
3:13 178
4:13 . . . . . 45, 81
4:14 74
4:15 190
5:12 . . . . . 94, 123
5:13 42
5:17 109

I. PETER.

1:8 . . . . . 198, 201
1:11 178
1:16 143
1:18f 110, 200
2:6 72
3:1 42
3:3 200
3:14 165
3:17 165
4:9 105
4:12 110
4:13 109
4:15 59
5:1 73
5:2 204
5:8 . . . . . 186, 191
5:9 . . . . . 102, 150
5:12 . . . . . 132, 150

II. PETER.

1:1 75
1:4 . . . . . 27, 66, 74
1:9 . . . . . 170, 202
1:11 75
1:17 82
1:20 105
2:6 101
2:12 . . . . . 15, 195
2:19 110
2:20 75
3:9 105
3:14 113
3:15 74
2:18 75

I. JOHN.

1:1 40
1:4 78
1:21 85
2:2 122
2:12 78
2:19 163
2:22 . . . . . 203, 204
2:27 53
3:4 75
3:5 82
4:3 . . . . . 170, 202
4:6 202
4:16 75
4:18 71

5:4 18
5:10 . . . . . v59, 202
5:11 194
5:15 16
5:16 95
5:20 152

III. JOHN.

4 27

JUDE.

4 22
20 27

ROMANS.

1:6 104
1:7 63
1:8 77
1:10 166
1:11 154
1:13 158
1:17 . . . . . 104, 175
1:20 190
1:22 183
1:24 149
1:28 176
1:29 110
2:1 . . . . . 85, 91, 92, 121, 149, 172
2:4 24
2:12 72
2:13 122
2:19 183
2:27 196
3:2 209
3:4 . . . . . 152, 175, 200, 206
3:6 149
3:9 204
3:13 36
3:20 85
3:23 . . . . . 105, 139
3:24 . . . . . 58, 73, 74, 76
3:25 63
3:26 67
3:30 . . . . . 34, 166
4:7 41
4:9 149
4:12 . . . . . 106, 201
4:18 122
4:25 122
5:1 131
5:3 204
5:7 110
5:8 79
5:14 35
5:15 176
6:2 . . . . . 112, 160
6:4 . . . . . 74, 101
6:6 101
6:10 . . . . . 95, 112
6:11 79
6:15 83
6:16 . . . . . 148, 206
6:17 . . . . . 81, 208
7:1 174
7:3 . . . . . 153, 189
7:6 201
7:10 63
7:15 81
7:18 . . . . . 188, 189
7:24 91
7:25 79
8:1 74
8:2 74
8:3 . . . . . 74, 98, 172
8:8 112
8:9 . . . . . 202, 206
8:12 149

8:17 166
8:18 142
8:20 12
8:23 . . . . . 79, 119
8:24 110
8:26 . . . . . 79, 175
8:29 101
8:32 . . . . . 103, 132, 156, 205
8:38 149
9:3 . . . . . 129, 158
9:5 75
9:6 82
9:20 206
9:25 201
9:28 55
9:30 201
10:14 81
10:15 . . . . . 176, 179
10:18 . . . . . 203, 205
10:19 66
11:1 . . . . . 41, 177, 202
11:2 202
11:4 24
11:17 60
11:20 110
11:21 202
11:22 14
11:30 112
11:36 . . . . . 119, 120, 121
12:5 116
12:6ff 149
12:9 66
12:15 191
12:16 201
12:18 . . . . . 98, 121
13:7 71
13:8 203
14:2 . . . . . 69, 81
14:4 79
14:5 69
14:14 112
14:21 172
14:22 79
15:15 139
15:20 200
15:22 201
15:24 . . . . . 149, 174
16:2 102
16:6 97
16:11 26
16:18 . . . . . 76, 82
16:19 149
16:25 109

I. CORINTHIANS.

1:1 91
1:13 177
1:17 209
1:18 74
1:19 . . . . . 38, 143
1:22 159
1:29 85
1:31 . . . . . 150, 153
2:4 73
2:7 194
2:12 42
2:13 66
2:16 20
3:4 . . . . . 20, 85
3:8 76
3:9 73
3:10 73
3:13 178
3:21 102
3:22f 72, 148
4:6 . . . . . 85, 202
4:8 . . . . . 131, 157
5:1 82
5:6 73
5:8 155
5:10 202

5:11 135
6:3 205
6:7 . . . . . 85, 135
6:9 203
6:8 80
6:11 135
6:18 105
6:20 206
7:5 166
7:7 129
7:28 . . . . . 35, 139, 164, 165
7:31 93
7:35 . . . . . 30, 80
8:7 123
8:9 153
8:13 206
9:1 . . . . . 40, 177
9:2 . . . . . 167, 202, 205
9:4 203
9:6 203
9:8 . . . . . 179, 202
9:12 103
9:13 107
9:15 209
9:17 96
9:21 . . . . . 53, 101
9:26 206
9:27 152
10:12 155
10:16 81
10:17 159
10:19 184
10:22 129
10:27 164
10:28 164
10:30 109
11:2 . . . . . 40, 102, 159
11:5 109
11:13 80
11:21 81
11:28 105
12:2 173
12:11 110
12:15 203
13:2 199
13:3 52
13:7 64
13:8 195
13:12 . . . . . 47, 135
13:13 66
14:9 197
14:20 107
14:27 118
14:35 . . . . . 72, 178
14:39 201
15:1 82
15:4 145
15:8 . . . . . 14, 166, 176
15:10 82
15:12 148
15:16 162
15:20 148
15:27 184
15:31 207
15:33 209
15:37 165
15:42 . . . . . 44, 148
15:51 . . . . . 47, 204
15:55 18
16:6 . . . . . 98, 196
16:21 80
16:22 45

II. CORINTHIANS.

1:4 81
1:9 145
1:13 148
1:14 . . . . . 67, 113
1:17 207
1:22 11
2:6 113
2:13 112

2:15 112
3:12 110
3:15 173
3:16 . . . . . 122, 173
3:18 . . . . . 97, 122, 176
4:4 101
4:13 79
4:16 102
5:1 . . . . . 101, 164
5:13 110
5:14 . . . . . 101, 123, 124
5:15 105
5:20 197
6:14 . . . . . 45, 109
7:8 166
7:11 148
7:12 190
8:6 175
8:10 107
8:11 190
8:12 175
8:22 97
9:9 26
9:12 113
10:1 90
10:4 113
10:9 191
10:13 63
11:1 157
11:4 . . . . . 85, 206
11:21 184
12:2 . . . . . 116, 123
12:19 107
12:20 . . . . . 110, 200, 202

GALATIANS.

1:6f 85
1:9 157
1:12 149
2:1 119
2:2 152
2:7 . . . . . 67, 135
2:8 110
2:9 156
2:13 . . . . . 110, 155
2:14 184
3:1 123
3:4 205
3:13 124
3:19 . . . . . 47, 171
3:25 124
4:11 153
4:19 172
4:20 . . . . . 12, 129, 158
4:24 85
4:25 71
4:27 26
5:2 96
5:4 105
5:12 . . . . . 131, 157
5:24 101
6:3 82
6:10 173
6:11 . . . . . 84, 179
6:12 110
6:14 . . . . . 72, 131, 157
6:17 100

EPHESIANS.

1:3ff 209
1:4 117
1:8 18
1:14 82
1:17 . . . . . 50, 153
1:18 17
2:3 109
2:4 . . . . . 95, 96
2:12 104
3:1 117

3:5 107
3:16 44
3:19 105
3:20 . . . . . 59, 117
4:3 172
4:9 71
4:11 81
4:17f 64
4:18 . . . . . 105, 198
4:22 27
4:23 20
4:25 . . . . . 24, 132
4:28 194
4:29 154
5:3 112
5:4 141
5:5 . . . . . 82, 131, 132, 197
5:12 110
5:21 196
5:26 107
5:33 132
6:6 59

PHILIPPIANS.

1:11 97
1:13 24
1:15 85
1:18 . . . . . 109, 143
1:27 36
2:6 . . . . . 24, 189
2:8 107
2:9 75
2:12 140
2:15 . . . . . 82, 117
2:18 111
2:20 170
2:23 12
2:27 117
3:5 22
3:6 191
3:8 . . . . . 205, 206
3:9 80
3:12 . . . . . 164, 179
3:13 . . . . . 95, 102, 183
3:14 59
4:8 82

COLOSSIANS.

1:4 196
1:15 75
1:16 . . . . . 77, 102
2:9 75
2:14 107
2:23 59
3:1 111

I. THESSALONIANS.

1:5 82
1:8 203
2:7 176
3:1 106
3:5 152
3:8 162
4:2 35
4:8 206
4:9 79
4:16 74
5:5 101
5:8 191
5:10 122
5:23 157

II. THESSALONIANS.

1:3ff 209
1:4 30
2:15 . . . . . 96, 135
3:6 35
3:11 . . . . . 194, 209

HEBREWS.

1:1ff 209
1:4 . . . . . 82, 122, 175
1:9 95
2:2 122
2:10 119
2:13 . . . . . 39, 146
2:14 103
2:15 188
2:16 206
2:17 97
2:18 160
3:1 159
3:10 160
3:11 . . . . . 156, 166, 179
3:12 . . . . . 141, 153, 202
3:13 171
3:14 206
4:1 153
4:3 156
4:12 27
4:16 22
5:2 159
5:4 176
5:8 . . . . . 176, 197. 209
5:99 26
5:10 96
5:12 . . . . . 97, 145, 183
5:14 123
6:10 102
6:14 196
7:4 . . . . . 84, 209
7:9 . . . . . 154, 191
7:11 191
7:20 . . . . . 82, 159, 175
7:23 145
7:24 . . . . . 66, 75
7:25 67
7:27 124
8:2 81
8:3 . . . . . 151, 154, 169
8:6 . . . . . 56, 175
8:9 198
8:11 39
9:7 . . . . . 100, 169
9:17 . . . . . 159, 202
9:23 28
9:26 . . . . . 149, 159, 166
10:2 . . . . . 149, 159, 166
10:13 100
10:25 . . . . . 110, 195
10:25 110
10:35 175
10:37 . . . . . 82, 174
10:25 195
11:3 204
11:9 41
11:15 163
11:21 174
11:32 198
11:33 143
12:1 . . . . . 149, 206
12:2 . . . . . 103, 119
12:5 103
12:6 160
12:11 105
12:13 209
12:17 206
12:18 112
12:20 102
12:22 . . . . . 25, 112
12:28 . . . . . 168, 169, 170
13:2 . . . . . 95, 195

13:5 204
13:13 206
13:16 110
13:23 194

I. TIMOTHY.

1:6 105
1:7 . . . . . 84, 178
1:13 74
1:15 70
2:6 124
2:8 . . . . . 26, 158
3:1 102
3:15 143
3:16 82
4:1 105
4:4 166
5:8 103
5:17 . . . . . 59, 103
5:19 166
5:22 102
5:25 24
6:4 59
6:5 . . . . . 96, 105

II. TIMOTHY.

1:12 . . . . . 151, 179
1:16 77
2:11 123
2:14 200
2:25 . . . . . 152, 153
3:2f 148
3:16 77
4:8 66
4:13 172
4:15f 16

TITUS.

1:11 . . . . . 170, 202
1:12 209
2:3 7
2:7 135
2:11 113
2:13 75
3:8 113
3:11 59

PHILEMON.

13 124
16 98
20 102

REVELATION.

1:4 . . . . . 64, 69, 82, 90, 208
1:8 69
1:9 75
1:13 26
1:18 . . . . . 22, 141
2:1 81
2:3 39
2:4 35
2:5 54
2:6 196
2:7 36
2:12 74
2:14 94
2:16 . . . . . 112, 113
2:17 105
2:20 36
2:25 171
3:3 93
3:4 . . . . . 39, 96
3:7 22

3:9 34
3:12 . . . . . 20, 91, 208
3:14 71
3:15 . . . . . 131, 157
3:17 75
3:21 91
4:1 . . . . . 45, 204
4:6 . . . . . 28, 117
4:9 173
4:11 71
5:3 204
5:4 204
5:6 22
5:7 . . . . . 40, 145, 208
6:6 101
6:8 . . . . . 111, 120
6:15 22
6:16 12
7:1 121
7:2 78
7:9 96
8:1 . . . . . 169, 173
8:13 180
9:4 149
10:8-10 208
11:9 . . . . . 34, 37
11:10 56
11:13 101
11:17 53
12:4 55
12:12 180
14:4 169
14:14 66
14:20 . . . . . 105, 116
15:2 109
15:3 92
16:18 82
16:19 90
17:3 102
17:8 167
17:17 171
18:3 54
18:10 180
16:18 82
18:17 76
19:3 39
20:3 171
20:5 172
21:21 . . . . . 28, 83, 116
22:9 200
22:19 38

INDEX OF SOME IMPORTANT GREEK WORDS.

(For alphabetical list of verbs see chapter on Principal Parts of Verbs. For alphabetical list of prepositions see chapter on Prepositions. The minute Table of Contents at the beginning of the volume will enable one to find easily the subjects treated as well as the various Greek words in their proper place and order. It remains only to give here various isolated Greek words that deserve special compilation.)

	PAGE
ἀββά	92
ἀγαθός	58, 59
Ἄγαρ	24
ἄγε	45
ἁγιασμός	60
ἅγιος	58
ἁγιώτατος	27
αἰών	23
αἰώνιος	26
ἀκήκοα	40
ἀκριβέστατος	27, 66
ἀλλήλων	31
ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος	59
ἅμα	19, 108, 110
ἀμφίς	19
ἀμφότεροι	23
ἄμφω	23
ἄν	13, 128, 162ff, 169
ἀνάβα	45
Ἀνδρέου	18
ἀντιπαρῆλθεν	60
ἀπεκατεστάθη	41
ἀπέσταλκαν	55
ἀποθανοῦμαι	38
Ἀπολλώ	20, 60
Ἀπολλώνιος	60
ἀπολῶ, ἀπολέσω	38
ἀπολύτρωσις	58
ἄρα	149
ἆρα	177
ἅρπαξ	26
ἀρραβών	11
ἀρχήν	67
ἄτεκνος	26
αὐτοκατάκριτος	59
αὐτός	30, 78, 79
ἀφέθησαν	41
ἀφεῖς	36
ἀφελπίζω	12
ἀφελῶ	38

ἄφες 45
ἀφέωνται 39
ἀφῆκες 35, 39
ἀφίδω 12
ἀφίουσιν 34, 37
ἄχρι 171
βάαλ 24
βαθέως 26
βαπτίζω 60
βάπτισαι 14
βαπτίσω 38
βασιλεύς 22, 23
βηθφαγή 24
βίηφι 19
βορρᾶ 18
βούλει 46
γάρ 149, 159
γέ 205
γέγονα 38
γέγραφα 38, 40
γένος 22, 23
γέρων 23
γῆ 72
γίνομαι 36
γινώσκω 36
γνοῖ and γνῷ 50
γογγύζω 60
γραμματεύς 22
δαίμων 21
δείκνυμι 57
δεῖγμα 57
δεῖξις 57
δεῖνα(ὁ) 31, 81
δεσμός, -μά 24
δεῦτε 179
δή 206
δημοσίᾳ 110
διδῶ 34
δίκαιος 58, 59
δικαιοσύνη 58
δικαιόω 58
δικαίωμα 58
δικαίως 58
δικαίωσις 58
δικαιωτής 58
δικαστής 58
δίκη 57
διό 149
διότι 159
διπλοῦς 59
δοῖ 42
δός 45
δύναμις 58
δύνομαι 34
δύο 23
δῴη and δοίη 50
δωρεάν 152
ἔα 179f
ἐάν 13, 128, 161, 169
ἐβέβλητο 41
ἐγενήθην 35, 47
ἔγνωκα 40
ἔγνων 34
ἐγώ 29f., 45, 78
ἐδολιοῦσαν 36
ἐδώκαμεν 35
ἐθελοθρησκία 59
εἰ 161, 162ff, 177
εἰδήσω 39
εἰδῶ 39, 42

εἰκόνα 23
εἴληφα 40
εἶμι 37
εἰς 68
εἶπα 35
εἰπόν 35
εἴτε 149
εἶχαν 36
εἶχοσαν 36
Ἑκατοντάρχης 18
ἑκατόνταρχος 18
ἐκεῖνος 30
ἐκέκραξα 35
ἐκκλησία 72
ἐκχεῶ 38
ἐλάχιστος 27
ἐλαχιστότερος 27
ἐλπιοῦσιν 38
ἐλπίς 12
ἐμβάλλω 11
ἐνκρίνω 11
ἐξέδετο 35
ἐξώτερος 27
ἐπροφήτευσεν 41
ἔρημος 26
ἐριθία 11
ἐπάν 173
ἐπεί 159, 173
ἐπειδή 159
ἐπειδήπερ 159
ἐς 45
ἑστάναι 38
εὐγενής 26
ἑώρακα, ἑόρακα 40, 54
ἕως 171
ἤ 148
ἠδυνήθην 41
ἧκω 38, 52
ἦλθαν 35
ἥλιος 72
ἡμάρτησα 35
ἡμέτερος 30
ἡμίσους 26
ἡμῶν αὐτῶν 30
ἡνίκα 173
ἠνεῴχθησαν 41
ἠργάσατο 41
Ἡρῳδιανός 60
ἠρώτουν 36
ἤφιε 37
θάλασσα 72
θέλω 12
θές 45
θυγάτηρ 21
ἴδε 14, 44, 179
ἰδίᾳ 110
ἴδιος 31
ἰδού 179
Ἰεροσόλυμα 20, 24
Ἰερουσαλήμ 20
Ἰησοῦ 20
ἵλεως 26
ἵνα .....152ff.
ἴσασιν 39
ἱστάνω 34
ἰ(εἰ)στήκειν 52
ἰχθύς 22
καθά 175
καθάπερ 175
καθαρός 58

καθό 175
καθότι 159, 175
καθώς 175
καθώσπερ 176
καί 147
καινός 58
καίπερ 167
καλέσω 38
καλο-διδάσκαλος 7
καλός 58, 59
Καπερναούμ 11
καυθήσωνται 52
κεκοπίακες 39
κεκράξουσιν 39
κέρας 22, 23
κερδηθήσωνται 42
κεφαλῆφιν 19
κήρυξ 21
κλεῖς 21
κοινή 5, 6
κόσμος 72
κρυφῇ 110
κύκλῳ 106
Κῶ 20
λάβε 44
λογία 11
λογομαχία 59
Λύστραν 18
Λύστροις 18
λύτρον 58
μάλιστα 27
μᾶλλον 27
Μάρθας 18
Μαρία 18
Μαριάμ 18
μάταιος 26
μέγιστος 27
μειζότερος 27
μείζων 26, 27
μέν 206
μέλλω 37, 139
μέχρι 172
μή ..152, 167, 170, 177, 198, 199ff.
μηδέ and other compounds .199ff.
μικρότερος 27
μονόφθαλμος 59
Μωυσῆς 18
ναί 206
ναῦς 22
νέος 58
νή 207
νίκη 18
νῖκος 18
νουνεχῶς 65
νοῦς 20
νύκταν 20
ὁ, ἡ, τό .....68ff.
ὅδε 30
ὁδός 20
ὀδυνᾶσαι 46
οἴδαμεν 39
οἰκοδομήθη 41
οἶκος 72
οἷος 30, 179
ὀλίγος 12
ὁμολογουμένως 65
ὁποῖος 31, 179
ὅπως 152
ὀρέων 22
ὅς .....31, 168f.

ὅσιος 26, 58
ὅσον 175
ὅσος 31, 179
ὀστέα 20
ὅστις .....31, 169f.
ὅταν 173
ὅτε 173
ὅτι 149, 156, 181, 183
οὐ .....177, 198, 199ff.
οὐά .....179f.
οὐαί .....179f.
οὐδέ and other compounds ..199ff.
οὖν 149
οὐρανός 72
οὔτε 149
οὗτος 30
ὄψῃ 46
ὄψησθε 42
ὄφελον 130, 157
ὀφθαλμοδουλία 59
πανοικεί 110
πανπληθεί 110
πάντᾶ 19
πάντῃ 110
πανταχῇ 109
παπᾶς 17
παρελάβοσαν 35
παρῴκησεν 41
πατήρ 21
πειρασμός 60
πεῖν 33, 54
πένης 26
πέπτωκαν 54
πέπτωκες 54
πεφίμωσο 45
περισσότερον 27
πέρ 206
πεσοῦμαι 38
πηλίκος 179
πίεσαι 46
ποίμαι 37
πλήρης 27
πληροῦν 33
πλοῦτος 17f., 24
ποιμήν 21
ποῖος 30
πόλις 21, 22
πολιτάρχας 18
πόσος 31, 179
πότε 179
πότερον 179
πρεσβύτερος 60
πρίν 172
προστίθημι πέμψαι 7
προορώμην 41
προσωπολήμπτης 59
πρότερος 27
πρῶτος 28, 66
πῶς 179
ῥαντίζω 60
σάββατον 17
σεαυτοῦ 30
σημεῖον 58
σκάνδαλον 57
σκέπτομαι 59
σκοπή 59
σκοπιά 59
σκοπός 59
σκώψ 59
Σολομῶντος 22

σπείρης 18
στήκω 36
σύ 29f., 45, 78
συγγενής 11, 26
συγγενίς 26
συγκοινωνός 60
συνειδυίης 18
συνίουσιν 37
συνπάσχω 11
σχές 45
σῶμα 23
τάχα 108, 110
τάχιον(ειον) 27
τε 147
τεθεμελίωτο 41
τέρας 58
τέσσαρες 28
τέσσερα 13, 28
τεσσεράκοντα 28
τεσσερακονταετής 28
τετήρηκαν 39
τις 31
τίς 31, 178, 185
τοί 206
τοιγαροῦν 149
τοίνυν 149
τοιοῦτος 30
τομώτερος 27
τόσος 30
τοσοῦτος 31
τυχόν 98
ὕδωρ 23
ὑμέτερος 30
ὑμῶν αὐτῶν 30
ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ 117
φάγεσαι 46
φάγομαι 37
χαμαί 19
χάρις 22, 65
χειλέων 22
χεῖραν 20, 22
Χριστιανός 60
Χριστός 14
χρυσᾶν 26
ὦ ..... 179f.
ὡς 152, 155, 156, 160, 173, 175
ὥστε 155